Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/mediaeval-studies_1955_17

MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

Volume XVII
1955

PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES
TORONTO, CANADA

NIHIL OBSTAT.
TERENTIUS P. McLAUGHLIN
C.S.B.
Cens. Dep.

IMPRIMATUR.
✠JACOBUS C. CARDINALIS McGUIGAN
Archiep. Torontin.

Published Annually by
THE PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES
59 Queen's Park Crescent,
Toronto 5, Canada.
Subscription $7.00 a Year.
Managing Editor: Alex. J. Denomy C.S.B.

PRINTED IN CANADA
BY GARDEN CITY PRESS CO-OPERATIVE, TORONTO

CONTENTS

The *Sententiae Magistri A* (Vat. *Ms lat.* 4361) and the School of Laon .... *Nicholas M. Haring S.A.C.* 1

The Papacy and Missionary Activity in the Early Middle Ages........ *Rickard E. Sullivan* 46

Hugues de Saint-Victor, Auteur d'une *Practica Geometriae*........ *Roger Baron* 107

Chaucer's Mediaeval World Outside of Great Britain........ *Francis P. Magoun, Jr.* 117

The Cistercian Everard of Ypres and His Appraisal of the Conflict between St. Bernard and Gilbert of Poitiers........ *Nicholas M. Haring S.A.C.* 143

Chaucer's Retraction and Mediaeval Canons of Seemliness .... *William A. Madden* 173

John of Jandun and the Divine Causality........ *Armand Maurer C.S.B.* 185

Mediaevalia:

- I. Chaucer's Cook-Host Relationship .... *R. M. Lumiansky* 208
- II. The Vulgate Tradition of the *Consolatio Philosophiae* in the Fourteenth Century........ *Barnet Kottler* 209
- III. On the Sources of *The Prioress's Tale*........ *J. C. Wenk* 214
- IV. The *Félire Oengusso* and the *Martyrologium Wandalberti* .... *John Hennig* 219
- V. A Middle English Mnemonic Poem on Usury........ *R. H. Bowers* 226
- VI. Boetius of Dacia and the Double Truth........ *Armand Maurer C.S.B.* 233

The Letter of Heloise on Religious Life and Abelard's First Reply........ *J. T. Muckle C.S.B.* 240

COPYRIGHT, 1944, BY
THE PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES
59 QUEEN'S PARK CRESCENT, TORONTO

The *Sentientiae Magistri A* (Vat. *Ms lat.* 4361) and the School of Laon

NICHOLAS M. HARING S.A.C.

I.

THE so-called *Sententiae magistri A* is a compilation of predominantly patristic excerpts. It has long been known as one of the collections used by Gratian whose *Decretum* was published about the year 1140. It derives its name from the *explicit* of Paris, B.N. *Ms lat.* 3881, *fol.* 230: *Explicit liber sententiarum magistri A.* The letter *A* has generally been considered as the initial of Alger of Liège, but in the course of this article I hope to establish good reasons that the substitution of *magister Anselmus* for Alger enjoys a far greater measure of probability. Since *magister A* made copious borrowings from the works of Ivo of Chartres, especially his *Panormia,* it is beyond doubt that the compilation known as *Sententiae magistri A* was made after 1195, the date of Ivo's *Panormia.*[1] A more accurate dating of its *terminus a quo* may become possible by the dating of a text on the Eucharist[2] which appears to have originated in the school of Anselm of Laon (d. 1117). However, there is evidence that the collection grew as time went on and only a careful collation of the extant manuscripts will enable us to distinguish between the original compilation and later accretions.

While its importance for the history of the sources of canon law has been repeatedly discussed for over a century,[3] no serious efforts have been made to investigate whether or not the *Sententiae magistri A* (henceforth referred to as *SMA*) left any traces in the theological literature of the twelfth century.[4] On odd occasions, the problem has been touched by some authors. Thus J. de Ghellinck was faced with the question whether the *SMA* served as intermediary between Hugh of St. Victor's exposition of Holy Orders and Ivo's sermon[5] on this subject. He decided against such an intermediate transmission on the grounds that Hugh of St. Victor would not copy from "Alger".[6] Without accepting this particular argument, H. Weisweiler[7] confirmed and improved de Ghellinck's view on Hugh of St. Victor's immediate source, but offered ample proof that Hugh was quite familiar with the *SMA*.

Once such a fact is established, it still remains to be shown how extensively authors used the collection. It goes without saying that the answer to this question is rather difficult in cases where other collections, known to the same writer, could have furnished him with the same source material. The present study is meant to be a first attempt to explore the range of influence of the *SMA* on the *theological* literature of the first half of the twelfth century. The results of such an exploration will prove very helpful in tracing the literary channels which provided theological writers with their patristic and post-patristic texts. A closer examination of these texts will also prove very useful in dating such works as can be shown to contain borrowings from the collection. It is, however, not the writer's intention to investigate here the literary sources of the *SMA* itself, except in a few instances selected to characterize both the compiler and those who made use of his compilation.[8]

---

[1] Fournier-LeBras, *Hist. des coll. canoniques* II (Paris, 1932), p. 331.

[2] H. Weisweiler, "Das Scrifttum der Schule Anselms von Laon und Wilhelms von Champeaux in deutschen Bibliotheken", *Beiträge,* XXXIII (1936), 189 ff. In Vat. *Ms. lat.* 4361 the text is found on fols. 112 f.

[3] See the article on Alger of Liège by A. Amanieu, *Dict. de droit canonique* I (Paris, 1935), 390-403.

[4] J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du XII^{e} siècle* (Bruges, 1948), p. 123 writes: Ces *Sententiae Magistri A.* nous donnent, sans guère de commentaire, sur les principaux points de la doctrine révélée une série d'attestations patristiques, qu'on a cru être entrées en partie dans le *Decretum* de Gratien et avoir enrichi directement ou indirectement le dossier patristique du *Magister Sententiarum.* C'est là le principal intérêt de l'oeuvre.

[5] PL 162, 513 ff.

[6] "Le Traité de Pierre Lombard sur les sept ordres ecclésiastiques". *Rev. d'hist. eccl.,* X (1909), 301: Hugues pouvait-il avoir copié Alger? n'était-ce pas plutôt l'inverse qui avait dû se produire?

[7] "Die Arbeitsmethode Hugos von St. Viktor", *Scholastik,* XX-XXIV (1949), 76 ff.

The *SMA* was obviously composed to fill certain gaps left by Ivo of Chartres. As preserved in Vat. *Ms lat.* 4361, fols. 1-146, the collection is divided into twelve parts: De Trinitate (fols. 1 ff.), De Angelis (fols. 23ᵛ ff.), De Creatione primi hominis (fols. 27 ff.), De Homine post peccatum (fols. 32ᵛ ff.), De Originali peccato (fols. 36 ff.), De Primo statu angeli et hominis (fols. 41ᵛ ff.), Quid sit matrimonium (fols. 48 ff.), De Baptismo (fols. 80 ff.), De Corpore et s. Domini (fols. 102 ff.), De Ordinibus et ordinandis (fols. 114ᵛ ff.), De Omnipotenti voluntate Dei (fols. 135ᵛ ff.), De Horis (fols. 143ᵛ ff.).

The last two sections do not belong to the original compilation. This can be gathered from the very fact that the texts "on the omnipotent will of God" disturb the logical order and are actually a mixture of casually collected excerpts, most of which have nothing to do with the subject indicated in the chapter heading. It is equally evident that an exposition of "the (canonical) Hours" has no place in the sort of collection the original compiler had in mind. This is also confirmed by the scribe of Troyes, Bibl. munic. *Ms* 1180, fol. 81, who concluded the part on Holy Orders with: *Expliciunt sententiae.*[9] Hence we can safely assume that the original *SMA* consisted of ten parts.

Specifically the first six parts of the collection provide the kind of source material the theologians could not find, for instance, in Ivo's collections. The other four of the original ten parts, i.e., the sections on the sacraments contain heavy borrowings from Ivo's *Panormia* and offer very little new material with the exception of the part on matrimony. We shall find that these additions hold a key position in a study of the relationship between the *SMA* and the marriage doctrine of the school of Laon. These additions and the material not found in previous collections are, of course, the most important elements in the *SMA* from our point of view, because they reflect the compiler's personal intention and aim more clearly than do the parts copied from such earlier and well-known source-books as Ivo's *Decretum* and *Panormia.*

The compiler of the *SMA* was a theologian in a stricter sense of the word than Ivo of Chartres. He was a theologian who had a very definite concept and plan of theology in mind. In its general outline, this plan was distinctly new and so well conceived that its basic pattern has remained ever since. It is possible that the theologian was not engaged in scholastic activities, but it is more likely that his compilation was the result of lectures or personal experiences, in the sense that he wished to satisfy the need and demand for a source-book among both professors and students. We know that class-room activities in the early twelfth century consisted largely in commenting upon certain standard works, a practice which in theology meant commenting on the Sacred Scriptures. The commentary itself was generally little more than a *florilegium* of pertinent patristic excerpts.

Peter Lombard's commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul furnish some excellent examples of how certain Biblical passages could be used to enlarge on theological problems even within this rather casual framework of theology. But a more systematic approach to theology had been attempted and successfully made years before Lombard prolonged an older tradition, a tradition which he later helped to replace with lasting effect when he decided to compose his *Sentences.* The author of the *SMA* belongs to the first generation of scholars who initiated what is known as early scholastic theology. As said before, he had a definite plan of a theology beginning with the trinitarian God and ending with the sacraments.

---

[8] H. Weisweiler, "Die Arbeitsmethode", p. 235 draws attention to an anonymous chapter in the SMA beginning with: Quod infantes catechumeni efficiuntur. He shows that Hugh wove part of it into his treatise on Baptism and believes that the author of the *SMA* used a liturgical source. This "liturgical source" is no other than Theodulph of Orleans, *De Ordine baptismi*, 1-5; PL 105, 224B-227A.

[9] Cf. M. Bernards, "Ueber zwei Handschriften aus Clairvaux", *Rev. Bén.*, LXIV (1954), 120.

In those parts dealing with the sacraments the compiler of the *SMA* could and did rely on previous collections. To these sections he added certain elements suited to his purpose and, for the same reason, he selected texts from the vast mass of material offered in Ivo's popular *Panormia.* The personal additions are mainly derived from St. Augustine. It is he who really dominates in all those parts that we owe exclusively to the compiler's personal work. Without intending it to be the last word on the matter, I am convinced that the author of the *SMA* used an Augustinian *florilegium*—not the original works of St. Augustine—and that the systematic arrangement of parts is his original contribution to the development of scholastic theology. I shall show that the marriage treatise of the school of Laon grew directly out of the *SMA* and further research may confirm the opinion, based on this fact, that the *SMA* is indeed the standard collection of the school of Laon.

II.

We have previously referred to the use made of the *SMA* by Hugh of St. Victor. In his excellent articles on Hugh's *Arbeitsmethode,*[10] H. Weisweiler points out that the long chapter, entitled *De Discretione trium personarum in deitate una,*[11] is a straight transcription of texts from the *SMA.* An analysis of this *florilegium* will be given later in this study to illustrate the peculiarities which that particular section of the *SMA* had acquired by the time it reached the hands of Hugh of St. Victor. For the purpose of dating the *SMA* it is naturally more important to see whether earlier writers or works offer elements copied from our collection. The marriage treatise of the school of Laon has been mentioned in that connection and, in view of its numerous ramifications, a detailed demonstration of this dependence will constitute the second part of this study.

L. Ott notes that the *SMA*, as preserved in the Munich manuscript (*Clm*) 12668, contains a long passage from Fulgentius cited by Abelard.[12] Although this text is not represented in the Vatican manuscript, we can point to a number of other patristic excerpts which are common to both the *SMA* and Abelard's *Sic et Non.* However, we must first consider the possibility that the author of the *SMA* may have used Abelard's work. Chapters common to both, but of varying length, allow us to conclude that the compiler of the *SMA* did not copy from Abelard. As an example we may examine the text: *Augustinus in Enchiridion: Nam libero arbitrio . . . peccati servus est.*[13] The excerpt follows the original up to the quotation from *II Pet.* ii, 19. St. Augustine then continues: *Petri certe Apostoli est ista sententia, quae cum vera sit, qualis, quaeso, potest servi addicti esse libertas, nisi quando . . . peccati servus est.*[14] Both Abelard and the *SMA*[15] continue: *Quae autem potest esse libertas, nisi quando . . . peccati servus est.* Since the excerpt is longer in the *SMA*, the author did not copy it from Abelard. Hence Abelard copied it either from the *SMA* or used the same Augustinian *florilegium* as the compiler of the *SMA*.

On a later occasion Abelard cites two texts from St. Augustine in the following manner: *Augustinus, De Adulterinis conjugiis, lib. II: Quid tibi durum videtur*

---

[10] *Scholastik,* XX-XXIV (1949), 59-87; 232-267.

[11] *De Sacramentis* II, 1, 4; PL 176, 376A-381C.

[12] *Sic et Non,* 73; PL 178, 1245B. L. Ott, "Unters. zur Briefl. der Frühscholastik", *Beiträge,* XXXIV (1937), 366f.

[13] *Sic et Non,* 54; PL 178, 1426BC.

[14] *Enchiridion,* 9, 30; PL 40, 217.

[15] *SMA,* fol. 29^{rb}.

. . . *miseratione deletum. Item: Non erit turpis . . . adultera non vocetur.*[16] Both excerpts occur in Ivo's *Decretum* and *Panormia*, but not in the same order,[17] while the *SMA* offers them in the same sequence.[18] Equally interesting is another lengthy chapter quoted by Abelard: *Item: Quid ergo dicimus . . . Deo placere.*[19] It is a typical conglomeration in which either Abelard or his source chose what seemed more essential.[20] The very same compilation occurs in the *SMA*,[21] but Abelard omitted some sentences which he must have regarded as immaterial. This again proves that the author of the *SMA* did not borrow the text from Abelard and it is again safe to state that Abelard copied it either from *SMA* or from the Augustinian *florilegium* used by *magister A.*

In Abelard's *Sic et Non* the quotation just discussed is followed by: *Idem, De Bono conjugali: Bonum igitur nuptiarum per omnes gentes . . . proles, fides, sacramentum.*[22] Abelard's reading agrees very closely with the original.[23] In the *SMA*, however, the same passage is divided into two chapters which occur in two separate places. The first of them (*Bonum nuptiarum . . . ad judicium permanente*) contains an interpolation[24] and the second some abbreviations of the original text.[25] Abelard also cites excerpts found in both *SMA* and Ivo's collections.[26] In such cases, it seems, preference must be given to Ivo from whom Abelard definitely borrowed a number of texts.

If we evaluate the evidence, we cannot consider it quite certain that Abelard made use of the *SMA*, because the texts common to both may well derive their common peculiarities from some Augustinian *florilegium* used by both. But we can state with certainty that the author of the *SMA* did not make use of Abelard's *Sic et Non.*

The frustrating element of uncertainty, caused by the possibility of a common source, affects also certain texts in the *Summa sententiarum*. The author quotes: *Augustinus in libro quinto de Trinitate: Accidens dici non solet nisi aliqua mutatione rei, cui accidit, amitti potest. In Deo autem secundum accidens nihil dicitur, quia ei nihil accidit. Nec tamen omne, quod dicitur, secundum substantiam dicitur.*[27] In comparing this text to the Augustinian original, one would be very unfair to accuse the author of quoting carelessly. The quotation consists of two separate texts from Augustine the first of which reads: *Accidens autem dici non solet nisi quod aliqua mutatione ejus rei, cui accidit, amitti potest.*[28] In the next paragraph, i.e., after some 25 lines in the Migne edition, St. Augustine states: *Quamobrem nihil in eo secundum accidens dicitur, quia nihil ei accidit. Nec tamen omne, quod dicitur, secundum substantiam dicitur.*[29] The adjustment and combination of those two texts was not made originally by the author of the *Summa sententiarum*, but by the compiler of the *SMA*[30] or by the scholar who abbreviated St. Augustine's *De Trinitate* to cram it into a *florilegium*. However, it stands to reason that this second alternative becomes less probable, the greater the number of identical excerpts, because it is very improbable that two writers should constantly choose exactly the same texts.

Consider another example: *Augustinus: Ideo tres dicimus personas, non ut aliqua intelligatur essentiae diversitas sed ut vel uno vocabulo responderi possit, cum dicitur, "quid tres, vel quid tria"? Idem: Cum quaeritur, qui tres vel quae*

---

[16] *Sic et Non*, 128; PL 178, 1558C.

[17] *Decr.* VIII, 242; *Pan.* VII, 35 and 37; PL 161, 636B; 1289A; 1290A.

[18] *SMA*, fol. 77ra.

[19] *Sic et Non*, 125; PL 178, 1549C.

[20] Cf. *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 3, 4-4, 5; CSEL 44, 214 f.

[21] *SMA*, fol. 69ra.

[22] *Sic et Non*, 125; PL 178, 1549C.

[23] *De Bono conjugali*, 29, 32; CSEL 41, 226 f.

[24] *SMA*, fol. 50va.

[25] *SMA*, fol. 49ra. Augustinus in libro *De Virginitate*: Causa generandi . . . fides, proles, sacramentum.

[26] For instance, *Sic et Non*, 123; PL 178, 1545A: Item, Omne itaque bonum . . . nullum divortium. Isidorus . . . concubinatus. *Pan.* VI, 30 and 15; PL 161, 1249B and 1247A. *SMA*, fols. 56^{rb} and 48^{rb}.

[27] *Summa sent.* I, 9; PL 176, 55C.

[28] *De Trin.* V, 4, 5; PL 42, 913.

[29] *De Trin.* V, 5, 6; PL 42, 913 f.

[30] *SMA*, fol. 6^{vb}.

tria dicantur Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, dictum est "tres personae" quo nomine non diversitatem intelligi voluit sed singularitatem noluit.[31] The first of these texts occurs twice in the *SMA* and in two different versions.[32] The *Summa sententiarum* has the shorter reading and then adds the second text which in this form does not occur in St. Augustine[33] but in the *SMA*.[34]

In the same chapter the *Summa sententiarum* refers briefly to several other statements which St. Augustine makes in various books of his *De Trinitate*. They are joined together in the *SMA*. With the chapter before him, the author of the *Summa sententiarum* could very easily quote together what, in the original Augustine, is far apart, though not unrelated.[35] The text: *Ambrosius: Affectus tuus operi tuo nomen imponit*, is hardly the result of the author's familiarity with the works of St. Ambrose, because it is also found in the *SMA*.[36] Other excerpts could be cited to show the author's dependence on the *SMA*,[37] but it is perhaps more important to note that he used, apparently, the enlarged and therefore later edition of the *SMA*, as may be gathered from two identical chapters found in the eleventh part of the *SMA*.[38] Hence, it seems morally certain that the author of the *Summa sententiarum* made use of the *SMA*.

The factor of uncertainty which may surround a limited number of common texts becomes negligible when we encounter writers who simply transcribed one text after another in the same sequence as found in the *SMA*. One such author was Hugh of St. Victor. He made no attempt at all to check the accuracy of his source, when he decided to transcribe the teaching of the Fathers on the Trinity "without adding a word of my own".[39] He begins with: *Augustinus adversus impietatem Arii: Patres novum nomen . . . ejusdemque substantiae.*[40] It is a very free summary of an Augustinian text[41] as found in the *SMA*[42] where it is followed by: *Idem*: *Omnes catholici . . . usiam vocant.*[43] In copying this text, Hugh hardly realized that it was compiled from different books of a different work.[44] In dependence on the *SMA*, Hugh of St. Victor now quotes: *Idem in libro contra Maximum: Nulla sit . . . est Spiritus sanctus.*[45] With the exception of the first three lines (in Hugh's text) this quotation, consisting of two texts, is remarkably close to the original.[46]

The next excerpt takes us back to St. Augustine's work on the Trinity: *Idem in libro de Trinitate: Si solus Filius . . . genitus quae est Pater.*[47] To judge from the not very critical Migne edition, Hugh changed the original twice from *ea, qua ipse est, sua sapientia* (*intelligentia*) to *ea, quae ipse est, sua sapientia* (*intelligentia*).[48] If Hugh of St. Victor made the change, it must be a deliberate reaction against a tendency in theology which is generally connected with the name of Gilbert of Poitiers.[49] While the text just mentioned was chosen from the fifteenth book of Augustine's *De Trinitate,* the *SMA* now presents a chapter which is a compilation comprising six separate extracts from three different books of the same work: *Idem: Non quoniam Deus . . . et unum omnia.*[50] As previously noted, traces of the same chapter are found in the *Summa sententiarum.*

---

[31] *Summa sent.* I, 9; PL 176, 56A.

[32] *SMA*, fols. 12^{rb} and 20^{rb}. *De Trin.* VIII, 1; PL 42, 947.

[33] Cf. *De Trin.* VII, 4, 9; PL 42, 942: Quaesivit quid tria diceret. Et dixit substantias sive personas, quibus nominibus diversitatem intelligi voluit sed singularitatem noluit.

[34] *SMA*, fol. 19^{ra}.

[35] The chapter: Non quoniam Deus Trinitas . . . et unum omnia (*SMA*, fols. 18^{vb}-19^{ra}) is a partly rather free compilation from *De Trin.* VI, 7, 9; VII, 6, 11; V, 8, 9; VII, 4, 8 f.; VII, 6, 11.

[36] *Summa sent.* III, 15; PL 176, 113A. Ambrose, *De Officiis* I, 30, 147; PL 16, 71B. *SMA*, fol. 40^{rb}.

[37] Cf. *Summa sent.* III, 14; PL 176, 111A: Augustinus: Omnium bonarum rerum . . . Augustinus: Malum nihil aliud. . . . Augustinus: Abstinere a cibo. . . . The texts are copied from *Enchir.*, 23, 8; 10, 3; PL 40, 244; 236; *De Nat. et gratia*, 20, 22; PL 44, 257. They are found in *SMA*, fols. 39^{ra}, 39^{rb}, 40^{ra}.

[38] *Summa sent.* I, 13; PL 176, 65C: Augustinus in *Enchiridion*: Non fit aliquid. . . . quod justum est. (66D): Augustinus: Haec sunt magna . . . facere bonum. *Enchiridion* 95, 24; 96, 24; 100, 26; PL 40, 276; 279. *SMA*, fols. 136^{vb} and 135^{vb}.

[39] *De Sacramentis* II, 1, 4; PL 176, 376A.

[40] PL 176, 376AB.

[41] Augustine, *Contra Maximinum* II, 14, 3; PL 42, 772.

[42] *SMA*, fol. 17^{rb}.

[43] *SMA*, fol. 17^{va}.

[44] *De Trin.* I, 4, 7; PL 42, 824: Omnes . . . operentur. *De Trin.* V, 1, 2; PL 42, 912; Nam quo intellectu . . . nondum capitur. Intelligamus . . . usiam vocant This last text is also quoted in the *SMA*, fol. 8^{vb}, in Abelard's *Theologia 'Scholarium'* II and his *Sic et Non*, 9; PL 178, 1060C and 1366A. Cf. *Sent.* I, 8, 6: ed. Quaracchi, p. 63.

[45] *SMA*, fol. 18^{ra}.

[46] *Contra Max.* II, 10, 2; PL 42, 765 f. Cf. *Sent.* I, 19, 6; ed. Quaracchi (1916) p. 129.

[47] *SMA*, fol. 18^{rb}. PL 176, 377BC.

[48] *De Trin.* XV, 7, 12; PL 42, 1065 f.

The next quotation: *Idem: Denique si qua est . . . significant sed unum,*[51] is followed in the *SMA* by a short text which Hugh omitted: *Augustinus contra Maxim(in)um: Pater omnia, quae habet in sua substantia, dedit ei quem de sua substantia genuit.*[52] Without indicating a different source, the *SMA* then offers a text dealing with the Incarnation: *Neque persona Patris . . . sed sola persona Filii.*[53] This interesting text is hardly Augustinian;[54] in fact it seems to be of contemporary origin. But by introducing it with *Idem,* Hugh of St Victor implicitly attributes it to St. Augustine.

The *SMA* is more definite in the following quotation: *Idem in libro quinto de Trinitate: Deo aliquid accidere . . . secundum substantiam diceretur.*[55] This Augustinian text[56] is found in the same chapter which provided the excerpt now quoted by the *SMA* and Hugh of St. Victor: *Idem: Quamvis diversum sit . . . non est mutabile.*[57] The next five extracts are also taken from the fifth book of *De Trinitate,* though they differ widely in contents.[58] Hugh does not at all disturb the rather disorderly sequence of thought caused by copying the next two texts from the *SMA,* one of which is from the seventh[59] and the other from the eighth[60] book of *De Trinitate.*

Under the name of Jerome we now come upon an excerpt from the *Libellus fidei* of Pelagius: *Hieronymus: Unum in tribus . . . et nominibus distinguuntur.*[61] Then the *SMA* returns to Augustine's *De Trinitate* with passages copied from the seventh, fourteenth and fifteenth books. But Hugh of St. Victor continues with excerpts which may have been at the beginning of his collection: *Ambrosius de Trinitate: Assertio nostrae fidei . . . salvos fieri.*[62] The Vatican collection, it may be noted here, does not begin with St. Ambrose. The text consists of four parts and does not follow the sequence of the original.[63] Even more widely separated are the parts of the next extract: *Idem: Ego et Pater . . . ubi fides quaeritur.*[64] It may be worth noting here that a comparison of this text with that of the *Summa sententiarum*[65] points to the *SMA* as immediate source, because of the expression *vox silet* which reads *lingua silet* in Hugh of St. Victor.

In the Migne edition there is nothing to indicate that the following text: *Credimus unum Deum . . . Deus Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus,*[66] is a separate quotation, introduced in the *SMA* by the simple *Item.* It takes us to the *Liber eccles. dogmatum* of Gennadius[67] which is also the source of the next two passages: *Item: Non Pater . . . homo unus Filius. Item: Non ergo duo . . . nec immixtio.*[68] Hugh quotes them correctly as a unit by omitting the second *Item.* Both the *SMA* and Hugh of St. Victor wrongly present the next passage as belonging to the previous text.[69] The excerpt: *Ita enim Filius . . . major me est,* is a compilation from Augustine's *De Dono perseverantiae.*[70]

---

[49] Cf. N. M. Haring, "The Case of Gilbert de la Porrée", *Med. Studies,* XIII (1951), 12 ff.

[50] *SMA,* fol. 18^{vb}. PL 176, 377C-378A.

[51] *SMA,* fol. 19^{ra}. PL 176, 378BD.

[52] *SMA,* fol. 19^{va}.

[53] *SMA,* fol. 19^{va}. PL 176, 378D.

[54] Cf. *De Trin.* II, 10, 18; PL 42, 857; Sicut humanam illam formam ex Virgine Maria Trinitas operata est sed solius Filii persona est: visibilem namque Filii solius personam invisibilis Trinitas operata est.

[55] *SMA,* fol. 19^{vb}.

[56] *De Trin.* V, 4, 5; PL 42, 914: In Deo autem nihil quidem secundum accidens dicitur quia nihil in eo mutabile est. Nec tamen omne, quod dicitur, secundum substantiam dicitur.

[57] *SMA,* fol. 19^{vb}. PL 176, 378D-379A. *De Trin.* V, 4, 5; PL 42, 914: Quamobrem quamvis diversum sit . . . quia non est mutabile.

[58] *SMA,* fol. 20^{ra}. PL 176, 379AB. *De Trin.* V, 6, 7; 9, 10; 11, 12; 14, 15; 15, 16; PL 42, 915-921.

[59] *SMA,* fol. 20^{rb}. PL 176, 379B. *De Trin.* VII, 4, 9; PL 42, 941.

[60] *Ibid.* PL 176, 379B. *De Trin.* VIII, 1; PL 42, 947. Cf. *Summa sent.* I, 9; PL 176, 56A.

[61] *SMA,* fol. 20^{rb}. PL 176, 379BC: Pelagius, *Libellus fidei,* 6 f.; PL 48, 489BC. Cf. *Summa sent.* I, 11; PL 176, 59B: Hieronymus ad Damasum papam *De explanatione fidei. Sent.* I, 25, 3; ed. Quaracchi, p. 162.

[62] *SMA,* fol. 15^{va}. PL 176, 379CD. In Paris, B.N. *Ms., lat.* 3881, fol. 191, the collection begins with this text.

[63] Ambrose, *De Fide ad Grat.* I, 1, 6; 1, 10; 1, 6 f.; 1, 8; PL 16, 552B-553A.

[64] *SMA,* fol. 15^{vb}. PL 176, 379D-380A. *De Fide ad Grat.* I, 1, 9; 2, 16; 2, 17; 10, 64; 10, 65; PL 16, 553B-566A.

[65] *Summa sent.* I, 7; PL 176, 54A.

[66] *SMA,* fol. 16^{ra}. PL 176, 380AB.

The question whether the mixture and confusion of texts is due to later insertions or to a compilation used by the author of the *SMA* cannot be answered at the present stage of research, though it cannot be denied that the Augustinian excerpt fits well into the context. So do the next three extracts, the first of which is derived from Augustine's *Enchiridion* and reads: *Idem: Ex quo homo.......Verbum et homo.*[71] Hugh ommitted the introductory *Idem.* The next text: *Item, Christus Jesus . . . sed unus Filius,*[72] takes us back to the preceding chapter of the same source, Augustine's *Enchiridion,*[73] and in the last three extracts we return to the *Liber eccles. dogmatum.* The first of them still deals with the Incarnation: *Item, Deus assumpsit hominem . . . sine separatione distincta.*[74] It is worth noting that, allowing for certain characteristic omissions, the text begins exactly where the previous quotation from the same work ended. The following text: *Item, Nihil creatum . . . non tamen solitarium,*[75] is heavily but skilfully abbreviated from the original.[76] By way of contrast, the last extract is an almost literal transcription: *Item, Homousion i.e. in divinitate . . . in homine Deus.*[77]

In the *SMA* we have now arrived at the text with which Hugh began his *florilegium.* H. Weisweiler, who noticed the transposition, suggests that Hugh of St. Victor transposed the texts to give more prominence to his beloved St. Augustine.[78] While there are good reasons for agreeing with this suggestion, we may also assume that Hugh did not properly appraise this rather motley mixture of patristic texts. But the impression created by an analysis of this part of the *SMA* should not be generalized. Other parts of the collection are composed in a very orderly manner, not so much, perhaps, in the logical progression of thought as in the sequence of excerpts. Thus the fourth part, entitled *De Primo statu angeli et hominis* is compiled from two Augustinian works: *De Correptione et gratia* and the *De Gratia et libero arbitrio.* The latter provides only four of the eighteen chapters. These chapters are not arranged systematically, but were obviously transcribed as they occurred in the source. This seems to have been the case originally in the first part of the collection. Its Augustinian extracts reveal the same pattern, now broken by various insertions from other authors.

III.

We have previously affirmed that the *SMA* enjoyed an exalted position in the school of Laon. Among the eleven tracts published by F. Bliemetzrieder under the title: *Sententiae Anselmi,*[1] there are two treatises on marriage. The first of these is placed before the tract on Baptism and constitutes a brief summary dominated by the idea that, being a vestige of the Holy Trinity, the number three rules the various aspects of marriage.[2] Its position before Baptism may call to mind the arrangements in the *SMA*. A similar parallelism can also be seen in the sections dealing with the will of God which in both cases follow the sacramental sections.

---

[67] PL 42, 1213.

[68] *SMA*, fol. 16^{va}. PL 176, 380BC. *Lib. eccl. dogmatum*, 2; PL 42, 1213.

[69] *SMA*, *ibid.* PL 176, 380CD.

[70] *De Dono persev.*, 24, 67; PL 45, 1033 f. The phrase: qua minor est Patre, reads: qua major est Pater in the *SMA*.

[71] *SMA*, fol. 16^{vb}. PL 176, 380D. *Enchiridion*, 36, 11; PL 40, 250.

[72] *SMA*, fol. 17^{ra}. PL 176, 380D. Instead of *Item*, Hugh reads *Idem*.

[73] *Enchiridion*, 35, 10; PL 40, 249 f.

[74] *SMA*, fol. 17^{ra}. PL 176, 381A. *Lib. eccl. dogmatum*, 2; PL 42, 1213.

[75] *SMA*, fol. 17^{ra}. PL 176, 381AB.

[76] *Lib. eccl. dogmatum*, 4; PL 42, 1214 f.

[77] *SMA*, fol. 17^{rb}. PL 176, 381B. *Lib. eccl. dogmatum*, 5; PL 42, 1215.

[78] "Die Arbeitsmethode Hugos", p. 72.

[1] *Beiträge*, XVIII (1919), 47-153.

The second treatise on marriage is considerably longer, entirely different in style and composition.[3] Its most striking feature is the extraordinary number of quotations, the sum total of which is close to a hundred. As we shall see, the overwhelming majority of them was directly transcribed from the *SMA*, but the editor greatly complicated his task by trying to prove that Ivo's collections, Anselm's *Enarrationes in Matthaeum* and even the writings of such Carolingian authors as Jonas of Orléans and Hincmar, supplied at least a certain amount of the source material.[4] Occasionally, however, Bliemetzrieder expressed a suspicion that the writer of the treatise made use of an unknown collection. Our demonstration that this unknown collection was no other than the *SMA* can be based only on a comparative study of the quotations. Such a study, unfortunately, is continuously hampered by long textual omissions indicated in the edition by a number of dots. It seems that the editor chose this method whenever the textual agreement with the original source, mostly St. Augustine, justified this device to save printing space—a device which must have been as imperative in 1919 as it was in 1946.

Broadly speaking, the part of the *SMA* that contains the excerpts on marriage is divided into three sections. The first of these offers some twelve, mostly abbreviated, chapters from Ivo's *Panormia*. They concern the definition and institution of marriage. The second section presents extracts chosen mainly from Augustine's *De Bono conjugali, De Nuptiis et concupiscentia* and *De Peccatorum meritis*. It comprises some forty chapters of varying length. The choice of texts would seem to depend on the author's personal readings, though, as elsewhere, there are indications that he used an Augustinian *florilegium* rather than the complete original works. This dependence on a *florilegium* would account for some textual changes which could hardly be avoided in a process of abbreviating. A closer study of the extracts copied from Ivo's collections, however, discloses the fact that some of the textual changes were made by the compiler himself. The third section consists almost exclusively of texts transcribed from the sixth and seventh books of Ivo's *Panormia* and offers a greater variety of patristic, papal and conciliar sources.

The predominance of St. Augustine in the second marriage treatise of the *Sententiae Anselmi* is not so much the direct result of the author's personal preference for St. Augustine as the natural consequence of the source material put at his disposal by the compiler of the *SMA*. At the same time, the absence or omission of certain texts in the *SMA* explains why such questions as consanguinity and others are not extensively discussed.

In 1931, F. Bliemetzrieder published another marriage treatise of the same school.[5] The editor considered it a recension[6] of the second marriage tract published in the *Sententiae Anselmi*. H. Weisweiler[7] disagrees and maintains that the text edited in 1931 represents the earlier form of the original treatise.[8] We shall be able to show that Bliemetzrieder's view is the valid one.

In his monumental study of the literature connected with the school of Laon, H. Weisweiler edited yet another marriage treatise that begins with the words

---

[2] *Ibid.*, 112 f.

[3] *Ibid.*, 129-151.

[4] In his article "Gratian und die Schule Anselms von Laon", *Arch. f. k. Kirchenrecht*, CXII (1932), 52, Bliemetzrieder goes as far as to assert that the author relied on his memory and was little concerned about the wording of his quotations. We shall see that the very opposite is true.

[5] *RTAM*, III (1931), 274-288.

[6] *Ibid.*, 274: *Les Sententiae Anselmi* sont l'oeuvre magistrale; notre traité est le travail d'un elève.

[7] "Das Schrifttum", 29 ff. "Die Arbeitsmethode", 246.

[8] The missing part has been edited by H. Weisweiler, "Das Schrifttum", 33 f.

Decretum Dei fuit.[9] He considers the second tract in the *Sententiae Anselmi* the immediate source of this fourth treatise.[10] Our own detailed examination of its text-quotations will confirm Weisweiler's view on this relationship.

The popularity of the original marriage treatise of the school is further attested by another recension edited by Weisweiler.[11] To judge from its quotations, this short tract belongs to a later phase of development which, as we shall see, is characterized by a greatly reduced number of patristic texts, a less accurate manner of citing them and, in this particular case, by the appearance of such new names as Pope Nicholas and St. John Chrysostom who are not explicitly mentioned in the earlier treatises.

For the purpose of dating these marriage tracts, it is of importance to note that Hugh of St. Victor owes a great deal to the advances in the teaching on marriage made in the school of Laon.[12] The opinion, voiced by Bliemetzrieder,[13] that Hugh of St. Victor used the second and longer text published in the *Sententiae Anselmi,* was modified by Weisweiler in the sense that Hugh used not one but two marriage tracts of the school of Laon: in the first chapters the version published by Bliemetzrieder in 1931, later the longer treatise found in the *Sententiae Anselmi.*[14] Weisweiler's principal reason for this modification is the presence of a number of quotations in Hugh's *De Sacramentis* which we do not find in the first but in the second of these two treatises. Since we know with certainty that Hugh was familiar with the *SMA* and, in addition, cites some texts not found in either treatise but in the *SMA,* we may well dispense with Weisweiler's supposition of two treatises in favour of the *SMA* and the marriage tract published by Bliemetzrieder in 1931.

This elimination is valuable also for the approximate dating of those documents. Through our analysis of quotations it will become evident that the *SMA* must be considered not only the oldest of these literary works but also the immediate source book of the longer tract edited among the *Sententiae Anselmi.* If the short tract, contained in the same edition, has any relation at all to the other marriage treatises enumerated so far, it appears to be very extrinsic. Nevertheless, it definitely dates back to the first half of the twelfth century, because it was known to Zachary of Besançon, a monk of St. Martin's at Laon, who died about 1155. In his work *De Concordia Evangelistarum* he writes: *Nota in conjugio sanctae Trinitatis vestigium. Est enim vir principium unde mulier; utrumque principium unde procedit et tertium.*[15] Our short marriage treatise begins as follows: *In conjugio figura et vestigium Trinitatis multipliciter invenitur. Est enim vir principium unde mulier; uterque vero principium unde procedit tertium.*[16] There are other texts to prove that Zachary knew the tract.[17]

The treatise *Decretum Dei fuit* is undoubtedly a recension of the second tract found in the *Sententiae Anselmi* and it seems that the recension originated in southern Germany. As far as its source material is concerned, the author added only a more accurate reading of a text attributed to St. Leo.[18] Otherwise he was not very interested in quoting his texts verbatim. The number of his references to, and summaries of, patristic texts offered by the work he revised prove convincingly that he did not use the tract edited by Bliemetzrieder in 1931. In point of time, I believe, the *Decretum Dei fuit* is closer to the second treatise in the *Sententiae Anselmi*[19] than the tract just mentioned.

---

[9] "Das Schrifttum", 361-379.

[10] *Ibid.,* 43 f.

[11] *RTAM,* V (1933), 270-274.

[12] Gratian's relationship to the school of Laon is described by F. Bliemetzrieder, "Gratian und die Schule Anselms", 37-63. Since the points of contact seem to be very vague, Gratian's *Decretum* provides little help in an attempt to date the marriage tract.

[13] RTAM, III (1931), 273.

[14] H. Weisweiler, "Die Arbeitsmethode", 246 and 249.

[15] PL 186, 131D.

[16] *Sent. Anselmi,* p. 112.

[17] Compare Zachary (PL 186, 132A): Conjugium facit manifestus consensus legitimarum personarum, with *Sent. Anselmi* (p. 112): Tria quae faciunt: manifestus consensus legitimarum et praesentium personarum. Compare also Zachary: Impotentia reddendi carnalis debiti. Haec vero provenit infirmitate vel defectu membrorum seu frigiditate naturae, with *Sent. Anselmi* (p. 113): Impotentia reddendi carnalis debiti. Hoc (haec?) vero de tribus procedit, scilicet infirmitate, defectu membrorum et frigiditate.

[18] "Das Schrifttum", 377.

At the time when Hugh of St. Victor wrote his *De Sacramentis*, the marriage treatise preserved in the *Sententiae Anselmi* must have been somehow outdated by such shorter and conciser recensions as the one edited by Bliemetzrieder in 1931. In it we shall find ample evidence to maintain that, like the *Decretum Dei fuit*, it is a recension of the second treatise found in the *Sententiae Anselmi*. Although most of the manuscripts containing it are preserved in Germany,[20] the recension probably originated in France and, by the time Hugh wrote on marriage, was better known in Paris than the original. To supplement it, Hugh could and did rely on the *SMA* and Ivo's *Panormia*.

Since it is well known that Walter of Mortagne composed the marriage treatise attached as *tractatus septimus* to the *Summa sententiarum*, it seemed natural enough to examine its relationship to the *SMA*. A direct dependence cannot be proven, though Walter did not ignore the work done in the school of Laon. The same can be said of Master Simon[21] and Peter Lombard. The *Sentences* do contain a fair number of texts originally put in circulation by the *SMA*, but they are derived from secondary sources, especially the *De Sacramentis* and the *Summa sententiarum*.

Before we make our final source analysis of the various marriage treatises, we may single out a group of three texts which occasioned lengthy discussions on the concept of marriage. We read in the *SMA*:

> De perfecto conjugio Augustinus: Non est perfectum conjugium ubi non sequitur commixtio sexuum. Idem: Non habent nuptiae Christi et ecclesiae in se sacramentum, si eas non subsequatur commixito sexuum. Nec pertinere poterit illa mulier ad matrimonium, cum qua docetur non fuisse commixitio sexuum. Leo Papa: Cum societas nuptiarum ita ab initio constituta sit, ut praeter sexuum commixtionem non haberet in se Christi et ecclesiae sacramentum, dubium non est eam mulierem non pertinere ad matrimonium, in qua docetur non fuisse nuptiale mysterium.[22]

Under the same heading and in the same order this group occurs in what P. Fournier calls *The Collection in Ten Parts* (Paris, B.N., *Ms lat.* 10743) compiled in 1125-30. According to Fournier, its author may well be Hildebert of Lavardin who died in 1133.[23] The collection itself is described as a "revised and considerably enlarged edition of the *Panormia*".[24] The same group is also found in a later canonical compilation designated by Fournier as *The Second Collection of Châlon* of which only one copy is known to exist.[25] We need not examine its relationship to the *SMA* because it depends on the *Collection in Ten Parts*.

The information on the contents of the *Collection in Ten Parts* given by

---

[19] The Stuttgart manuscript of the treatise contains several additions copied from the recension edited by Bliemetzrieder in 1931. This may indicate also that the recension *Decretum Dei fuit* was made at an earlier date.

[20] Cf. *RTAM*, III (1931), 274. *Beiträge*, XXXIII (1936), 34 ff.

[21] Maître Simon, *Tractatus de sacramentis*; ed. H. Weisweiler (Louvain, 1937), pp. 45-61, offers some texts often cited in the school of Laon. But there seems to be no direct literary dependence.

[22] *SMA*, fol. 57^{rb}.

[23] Hildebert's letters dealing with questions related to marriage (PL 171, 207 ff.) contain a great number of quotations found in Ivo's collections, but no reference to our group of texts. He cites no excerpts which might indicate that he knew the *SMA*.

[24] P. Fournier, "Les collections canoniques attribuées à Yves de Chartres", *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes*, LVIII (1897), 442. Cf. Fournier-LeBras, *Hist. des coll. canoniques* II (Paris 1932), pp. 302 ff. Our three texts are found in chapters 2-4 of the fifth part. They are followed by *Pan.* VI, 26 (SMA, fol. 52^{vb}) and VI, 27 (*SMA*, fol. 57^{va}), Augustine "*Super Genesim*": Tripartitum . . . (*SMA*, fol. 49^{vb}), *Pan.* VI, 33 (*SMA*, fol. 58^{rb}).

[25] P. Fournier, "Les collections", 647. Date: 1130-1140:

Fournier suffices to prove that the compiler of the *SMA* did not derive his numerous Augustinian excerpts relative to marriage from this collection. On the other hand, there is not enough evidence to assume that the author of the *Collection in Ten Parts* must have transcribed our group of texts from the *SMA*. Since the group, with the exception of the Leonine decretal, does not occur in Ivo's collections, it must have originated at the turn of the century, at the earliest. Considering its doctrinal contents, it favoured the view that marriage is not "perfect" unless consummated by sexual intercourse. This is clearly stated in the first, allegedly Augustinian text. The fact that the statement openly contradicts St. Augustine's teaching and has not been found in any of his works justifies the assumption that the text is a corruption used to defeat the so-called consensus-theory of marriage.

Ivo of Chartres repeatedly quotes Pope Nicholas as saying: *Matrimonium facit consensus, non coitus,*[26] and in his numerous letters dealing with various marriage problems he does not seem to know the alleged Augustinian *dictum.*[27] The doctrine pronounced in it would have justified the conclusion that there was no true marriage between Mary and Joseph. When Abelard wrote his *Sic et Non,* this implication did not escape his attention. But he, too, must have been ignorant of the controversial text. He cites only the Leonine text,[28] but in a deteriorated form, and adds a liturgical testimony: *Beata mater et innupta Virgo.*[29] Abelard's distorted version of the papal decretal is very similar to the second text of our group where it is ascribed to St. Augustine. In fact, the second text is nothing but a distortion of the Leonine decretal and, if we compare the relative clause (*ubi non sequitur commixtio sexuum*) of the *first* quotation with the conditional clause (*si eas non subsequatur commixtio sexuum*) of the second, we cannot fail to see that their formation was also interrelated.

Even before our three texts were being passed on as a unit, scribal errors had paved the way for an indeliberate falsification of the Leonine text. Where St. Leo had written: *haberet . . . sacramentum,* Ivo's *Panormia* reads: *NON habeant in se nuptiae conjunctionis Christi et ecclesiae sacramentum.*[30] The *SMA,* as we have seen, reads: *non haberet in se Christi et ecclesiae sacramentum.* Thus, some scribal errors may have given rise to the short-lived opposition to the consent-theory.

The appearance of our dubious group in the *SMA* does not mean that the author intended to promote the doctrine expressed in it. He probably found it where the author of the *Collection of Ten Parts* discovered it. It was the scholars' task to propose an interpretation, not to ignore its existence. We know that the solution already proposed by the school of Laon hinged on the explanation of the word "perfect". It is an encouraging sign of scientific honesty to find the group again in Gratian's *Decretum,*[31] which offers a reading of the Leonine decretal close to that of the *Panormia* and a text of the other two passages from a source similar to the *SMA.*[32] In Lombard, only the order is changed and the wording slightly altered, so he too had to explain the text: *Item Augustinus: Non est perfectum conjugium sine commixtione sexuum.*[33] A strong advocate of the consent-theory, he was not fully satisfied with the insistence on *perfectum* in which the school of Laon saw the solution of the problem created by the three spurious and doctored texts.

---

[26] *Ep. XCIX;* PL 161, 119A. Cf. *Epp. CXXXIV; CXLVIII; CCXLII; CCXLIII;* PL 161, 143D; 153D; 250C; 251A.

[27] A. Wilmart, "Sentences d'Anselme de Laon", *RTAM,* XI (1939), 131, cites a fragment attributed to Ivo Carnotensis: Quia conjugium perfectum esse non potest sine carnali voluptate . . . non esset bonum sacramentum. There is no other evidence to confirm this attribution. The attribution is also weakened by the fact that Ivo never uses the Augustinian text so freely treated in the explanation of the introductory statement.

[28] *Ep. CLXVII,* 4; PL 54, 1204B.

[29] *Sic et Non,* 123; PL 178, 1545D.

[30] *Pan.* VI, 23; PL 161, 1248B. *Decretum* VIII, 139 (615D) reads: haberet. *Decr.* VIII, 74 (600A) has: haberet etiam. Cf. *Summa sent.* VII 6; PL 176 159D: etiam haberet.

[31] Gratian, *Decr.* C. 27, qu. 27, qu. 2, c. 16 f.

[32] Maître Simon, *Tract. de sacramentis;* ed. Weisweiler, p. 48 reads: Leo papa in decretis suis: Constat inter eos non fuisse Christi et ecclesiae sacramentum inter quos non fuerit commixtio sexuum.

[33] *Sent.* IV, 26, 6; ed. Quaracchi (1916), p. 915.

IV.

Regarding the subsequent text analysis, a word of explanation may serve to define the value and limitations of such an argument. In consecutive numeration will be found first the quotations cited by the author of the second marriage treatise in the *Sententiae Anselmi,* henceforth abbreviated as *SA*. As a general rule only the initial and final words of the quotations are cited, even in those cases where the edition provides the whole text or longer parts of it. Just as important as the text itself are the introductory words, because they often betray the author's source by the manner in which he refers to the work from which the excerpt was actually or allegedly taken. It can be said without exaggeration that the author of the *SA* did not consult a single Augustinian work in its original. After locating the author's immediate source, text variants will be pointed out and explained as far as possible. Explanations of this kind must occasionally remain conjectural: first of all whenever the edition of the *SA* does not furnish us with the entire transcription, and secondly whenever our text of the *SMA* appears to stand in need of correction. Although the Vatican manuscript used in this study is well written, it is definitely not flawless. At the end of each item will be found a reference to, or a text from, the treatise *Decretum Dei fuit* (abbreviated *DDf*), if the same text or sentences from it or merely allusions to it occur in the recension.

No attempt is made at any time to analyse parts of the marriage tracts other than text quotations, unless they happen to be closely correlated. This may appear to be a limitation and restriction, but our method offers a much more powerful argument than a comparison of identical or similar statements made by two authors, because in numerous instances they can be interpreted in opposite ways. After all, the author of a recension can add to or shorten the text on hand at will. Yet it is beyond doubt that, for instance, the comparison between the *SA* and the *DDf* establishes the priority, in time, of the former over the latter, because the *DDf* contains only fragments, often freely worded, of the texts found in the *SA*. The same method would show that the *DDf* cannot be based on the marriage tract published by Bliemetzrieder in 1931. But since this has not been questioned, our second series of text comparisons is designed to show that this last marriage tract is of more recent date than the *SA,* because its text quotations are more remote from the original source, viz., the *SMA* and *SA*. In the second place, text variants will be examined in the light of our knowledge of the immediate and remote sources. These variants will, whenever possible, be confirmed by comparison with the readings given by Hugh of St. Victor.

The third series of texts is devoted to Hugh's marriage treatise with the exclusion of his last few chapters which are a sort of *florilegium* culled almost completely from Ivo's *Panormia*. The marriage tract in the *Summa sententiarum* will be drawn upon only to compare texts directly related to our present study, while Peter Lombard's position will be briefly outlined to illustrate the lasting influence of certain patristic texts which ultimately owe their popularity to the choice made by the author of the *SMA*.

(1) Unde Augustinus: Nuptias divina conjugatorum instituit benedictio. Postquam masculum et feminam creavit, benedixit eis et dixit: *Crescite et multiplicamini.* Crescere est fecunditatem sexus accipere. Multiplicatio autem fit per junctionem maris et feminae.[1]

---

[1] *SA*, 130. The abbreviation *SA* designates the second marriage treatise edited by F.

This passage is the beginning of a chapter in the *SMA* which, because of later references, we transcribe in its entirety: Nuptias divina benedictio instituit. Postquam enim masculum et feminam creavit, benedixit eis dicens: *Crescite et multiplicamini.* Crescere est fecunditatem sexus accipere. Multiplicatio autem fit per conjunctionem maris et feminae. Cujus conjunctionis ratio nec post peccatum poenamque homini(s) defecit secundum quam nunc terra plena est hominibus. Potuerunt autem esse in paradiso honorabiles nuptiae et thorus immaculatus: hoc Deo praestante feliciter oboedientibus, ut sine inquieto ardore libidinis, sine ullo labore pariendi, fetus ex eorum semine gignerentur. Si enim non peccassent primi homines, eorum nutu imperarent membris genitalibus, quo pedibus cum ambulatur, ut neque cum ardore seminaretur neque cum dolore pareretur. Sed transgrediendo praeceptum motum illius legis, quae repugnat legi mentis, a membris conceptae mortis habere meruerunt, quam nuptiae ordinant, continentia cohibet, ut quemadmodum de peccato factum est supplicium sic de supplicio fiat meritum.[2]

Comparing the excerpt quoted in the *SA* with the same passage in the treatise *DDf*, we note that the latter argrees verbatim with the transcription of the *SMA*.[3]

(2) Unde Augustinus: Deus, inquit, masculum et feminam propagandi causa nuptiali castitate conjunxit.[4]

This text agrees literally with the *SMA*[5] and appears in *DDf* in an abbreviated form: Unde Augustinus: Deus conjunxit marem et feminam causa propagandi.[6] In both the *SMA* and the *SA* it is followed immediately by a sentence attributed to St. Ambrose.

(3) Ambrosius: Pudor est feminis nuptiarum praemia non habere, quibus sola causa est nubendi.[7]

The *SMA* has the same word order but reads: quibus *haec* sola.[8] With slight change of word order the author of the *DDf* wrote: Pudor est feminis praemia nuptiarum non habere, quibus *haec* est sola causa nubendi.[9]

(4) Cum omnibus ex gentibus ad implendum sanctorum numerum largissima suppeditat copia, libido sordidae voluptatis sibi vendicat, quod prolis necessitudo non poscit.[10]

The *SA*, as published, does not note the source of this statement. It is taken from the first part of the following chapter in the *SMA*: Cum ex hominibus ad implendum sanctorum numerum largissima suppetat copia, libido sordidae voluptatis sibi vindicat, quem sufficiendae prolis necessitudo non postulat. Denique utriusque sexus infirmitas propendens in ruinam turpitudinis recte excipitur honestate nuptiarum et quod sanis posset esse officium fit aegrotis remedium.

Neque enim (quia) incontinentia malum est, ideo connubium, quo inter continentes copulatur, non est bonum. Immo vero non propter illud malum culpabile est hoc bonum. Sed propter hoc bonum veniale est illud malum, quoniam id bonum quod habent nuptiae et quo bonae sunt nuptiae peccatum esse numquam potest.

Hoc tripartitum est: fides proles sacramentum. In fide attenditur, ne propter vinculum conjugale cum altero vel altera concumbatur; in prole, (ut) amanter suscipiatur, benigne nutriatur, religiose educetur; in sacramento, ut conjugium

---

Bliemetzrieder in the *Sententiae Anselmi*, *Beiträge*, XVIII (1919), 129-151.

[2] *SMA*, fol. 49^{rb}. Augustine, *De Gen. ad litt.* IX, 3, 5 f.; PL 34, 395.

[3] *DDf*, 362. The abbreviation *DDf* designates the marriage treatise *Decretum Dei fuit*, edited by H. Weisweiler in *Beiträge*, XXXIII (1936), 361-379.

[4] *SA*, 130.

[5] *SMA*, fol. 48^{vb}. *Pan.* VI, 22; PL 161, 1248A.

[6] *DDf*, 362.

[7] *SA*, 130.

[8] *SMA*, fol. 48^{vb}. *Pan.* VI, 24; PL 161, 1248B.

[9] *DDf*, 362.

[10] *SA*, 130.

non separetur et dimissus aut dimissa nec causa prolis alteri conjungatur. Haec est tamquam regula nuptiarum qua vel naturae decoratur fecunditas vel incontinentiae regitur pravitas.[11]

The first sentence quoted above is only slightly changed in the treatise *DDf*. It confirms the original *postulat* (instead of *poscit*) and reads: Unde Augustinus: Cum ex omnibus gentibus . . . postulat.[12] The explicit attribution to St. Augustine shows that at least his name must have headed the sentence in the copy of the *SA* used by the author of the *DDf*.

(5) Unde Augustinus in libro *De Virginitate*: Causa generandi nuptias fieri testatur Apostolus dicens: *Volo juniores nubere*. Et causam subjunxit: *filios procreare*.[13]

The chapter in the *SMA* from which this passage was copied is worded as follows: Augustinus in libro *De Virginitate*: Causa generandi nuptias fieri Apostolus testatur dicens: *Volo juniores nubere*. Et causam subjungit: *filios procreare*, ad fidem castitatis; illud pertinet ad sanctitatem sacramenti: uxorem a viro non discedere quod si discesserit manere innuptam aut viro reconciliari. Haec omnia bona sunt propter quae (nuptiae) bonae sunt: fides, proles, sacramentum.[14]

The text goes back to St. Augustine's *De Bono conjugali*.[15] By attributing it to *Augustinus in libro De Virginitate* the author of the *SA* betrayed his source, viz., the *SMA* which begins the passage with the same introduction. According to his general custom, the writer of the *DDf* put it more indefinitely: Unde Augustinus: Causa generandi . . . filios procreare.[16]

(6) Hoc modo dicens: Solet quaeri . . . consortium.[17]

This rather popular chapter is found in the *SMA*[18] and since its author copied it from Ivo's *Panormia*,[19] we can dispense with a transcription. The writer of the *DDf* summarized it freely in his claim: Augustinus: Quaeritur etiam si masculus . . . permanendi voluntatem.[20]

(7) Augustinus *super Genesim* confirmat dicens: Utriusque sexus infirmitas . . . remedium.[21]

It will be recalled that this text occurs in the chapter of the *SMA* from which our author copied the fourth quotation. The Vatican manuscript cites Augustine's name only without adding the name of the treatise, but it is quite possible that the copy used by the author of the *SA* was more explicit. The treatise *DDf* also omits the reference to the Augustinian work: Unde Augustinus: Utriusque sexus . . . sit remedium.[22]

(8) Augustinus *super Genesim*: Multiplicatio fit per conjunctionem maris . . . fiat meritum.[23]

This text goes back to a chapter already transcribed in connection with the first passage from the *SMA*. Here again the author of the *SA* seems to have had a copy specifying the Augustinian work from which the text was derived. The chapter was known to the writer of the *DDf* who states: Unde Augustinus: Poterant in paradiso . . . gignerentur filii.[24] As usual he used his text with more freedom than the author of the *SA*.

---

[11] *SMA*, fol. 49^{vb}. Augustine, *De Gen. ad litt.* IX, 7, 12; PL 34, 397.

[12] *DDf*, 363.

[13] *SA*, 130. I *Tim.* v, 14.

[14] *SMA*, fol. 49^{ra}. Cf. *Pan.* VI, 30; PL 161, 1249B. Hincmar, *Ep. XXII*; PL 126, 139C. Abelard, *Sic et Non*, 125; PL 178, 1549D.

[15] *De Bono conj.*, 29, 32; CSEL 41, 227.

[16] *DDf*, 363.

[17] *SA*, 130.

[18] *SMA*, fol. 57^{ra}.

[19] *Pan.* VI, 27; PL 161, 1248D. *Decr.* VIII, 65; PL 161, 597D. Gratian, *Decr.* C. 32, qu. 2, c. 6. Lombard, *Sent.* IV, 31, 2; ed. Quaracchi (1916) p. 937.

[20] *DDf*, 363.

[21] *SA*, 130.

[22] *DDf*, 362.

[23] *SA*, 131.

[24] *DDf*, 362.

(9) Augustinus *ad Valerium*: Non esset in homine pudenda concupiscentia, si non peccasset. Nuptiae vero essent, etsi non peccaret. Filii enim generarentur sine morbo concupiscentiae isto in corpore vitae illius. Sed non fit modo.[25]

The corresponding chapter in the *SMA* reads: *Augustinus ad Valerium*: Non esset in homine pudenda concupiscentia, si non peccasset. Nuptiae vero essent, etiamsi non peccarent. Filii enim generarentur sine morbo isto in corpore vitae illius, si(ne) quo modo non sit.[26]

(10) Augustinus liquide ostendit scribens *ad Valerium*: In parentibus Christi . . . pudor.[27]

The first part of this long quotation is found in Ivo's *Panormia*,[28] but was not transcribed from this collection. It stems directly from the *SMA* where it is introduced by *In eodem*.[29] In consulting the collection, the author of the *SA* could easily find the significance of this reference in a previous chapter entitled: Augustinus *ad Valerium*. This very same chapter is quoted by the author of the *SA* in the following manner:

(11) Idem in eodem: Motum inoboedientem . . . bonae voluntatis.[30]

In the *SMA* this compilation reads: Augustinus *ad Valerium*: Motum inoboedientem primi homines ex peccato in carne sua senserunt et nuditatem erubescentes foliis texerunt, ut saltem arbitrio velaretur quod non arbitrio movebatur. Sed nec isto malo adjecto potuit perire nuptiarum bonum. Quod enim postea illi genuerunt, hoc est conjugii bonum. Quod vero prius confusionem texerunt, hoc est concupiscentiae malum quod vitat conspectum et quaerit pudendo secretum. Proinde nuptiae, quia etiam ex illo malo aliquid boni faciunt, gloriantur; quia sine illo fieri non potest, erubescunt. Sed nec propter libidinis malum nuptiae damnantur nec propter nuptiarum bonum libidinem laudamus.

Hoc malo concupiscentiae homo utitur, non vincitur, quando eam inordinate aestuantem frenat et cohibet neque nisi propagini consulens relaxat atque adhibet, ut gignat carnaliter, regenerando spiritualiter. Quod si provenerit, merces erit de conjugio plenae felicitatis. Si autem non provenerit, pax erit conjugibus bonae voluntatis.[31] This text accounts for the short quotation in *DDf*: Et item: Non propter conjugium libidinem laudamus nec propter conjugium libidinem damnamus.[32]

(12) Idem: Bonarum bonum nuptiarum . . . pudicitia conjugalis.[33]

Its complete (but corrupt) text reads in the *SMA*: Nuptiarum bonum non extinguit sed modificat inoboedientium membrorum malum, ut immitata quodammodo concupiscentia carnalis fiat saltem pudicitia conjugalis.[34]

(13) Unde Augustinus *De Bono conjugali*: Bonum conjugii non est fervor . . . restringens connubio.[35]

In the *SMA* this long chapter is more accurately attributed to *Augustinus*: *De Baptismo parvulorum*, a title frequently used in the Middle Ages to designate his *De Peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum*.[36]

(14) Augustino hoc testante, videlicet *De Bono conjugali*, hoc mode: Conjugalis concubitus . . . thori fidem.[37]

---

[25] *SA*, 131.

[26] *SMA*, fol. 49^{ra}. *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 1, 1; PL 44, 414.

[27] *SA*, 132. *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 11, 13; PL 44, 421.

[28] *Pan.* VI, 30; PL 161, 1249B: Omne itaque . . . futurus erat sine peccato.

[29] *SMA*, fol. 56^{rb}.

[30] *SA*, 132.

[31] *SMA*, fol. 55^{va}. Compiled from *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 6, 7-8, 9; CSEL 41, 418 f. The words: carnaliter, regenerando spiritualiter, are missing in the Vatican copy of the *SMA*.

[32] *DDf*, 363.

[33] *SA*, 132.

[34] *SMA*, fol. 49^{rb}.

[35] *SA*, 132.

[36] *SMA*, fol. 50^{ra}. *De Peccat. meritis* I, 29, 57; PL 44, 141 f.

[37] *SA*, 132. Cf. *Summa sent.* VII, 3; PL 176, 156C. *Sic et Non*, 130; PL 178, 1560B.

Although the chapter in the *SMA* from which this excerpt was copied bears only the heading: *In eodem,* the author could easily substitute the full title, found on the previous folio: *Augustinus De Bono conjugali.* The excerpt reads: Conjugalis vero concubitus gratia gignendi non habet culpam, concupiscentiae vero satiandae, sed tamen cum conjuge, propter thori fidem, hoc (est) inter fideles, venialem habet culpam.[38] In the treatise *DDf* the passage appears in this form: Unde Augustinus: Carnalis concubitus, qui fit causa prolis, non habet culpam; concupiscentiae vero satiandae, sed tamen cum conjuge, habet culpam, venialem tamen propter fidem thori.[39]

(15) Unde Augustinus in eodem: Quicquid . . . propter nuptias ignoscitur.[40]
This excerpt is the beginning of the chapter from which the previous passage was transcribed and reads in the *SMA*: Quicquid inter se conjugati immodestum, inverecundum sordidumque gerunt, vitium hominum est, non culpa nuptiarum. Et si pravi mores ad talem concubitum impellunt, nuptiae tamen ab adulterio seu fornicatione defendunt. Et quod sic geritur, propter nuptias ignoscitur.[41] The author of *DDf* handled it freely: Quicquid conjugati immodestum, inverecundum sordidumque agunt, non est vitium nuptiarum sed culpa hominum, quae tamen per nuptiale bonum excusatur, nisi fiat contra naturam vel impediat tempora orationis.[42] The conditional clause (*nisi . . . orationis*) is taken from the chapter: Concubitum qui non fit causa prolis nuptiae non cogunt fieri, imperatur ignosci, sed tamen sit minimus, ut (non) impediat tempora, quae orationi debentur, nec immutetur in eum usum, qui contra naturam est.[43] The chapter is listed under No. 19.

(16) Item in eodem: In conjugio aliquid boni . . . frangitur.[44]
This text constitutes an entire chapter in the *SMA* part of which is quoted by Hugh of St. Victor.[45] In the Vatican manuscript of the *SMA* we do not meet the sentence found within the quotation of the *SA*: Numquam enim tanta est societas ejusdem sexus quanta est diversi i.e. non est tanta caritas inter virum et virum, et feminam et feminam, quanta est inter virum et feminam.[46] Since it is also absent in St. Augustine, we may presume that it is the author's own interpolation.

(17) Augustinus *De Sancta viduitate*: *Tantum ergo bonum . . . sive adulterii.*[47]
This complete chapter from the *SMA* dates back to St. Augustine's *De Bono viduitatis* which the compiler of the SMA introduces thus: Idem in libro *De Sancta Viduitate*: Tantum est bonum fidelis conjugii . . . fornicationis sive adulterii.[48] The text contains an interpolation which the compiler seems to have borrowed from a commentary on *I Cor.* vii.

(18) Idem Augustinus: Non quia incontinentia . . . peccatum esse non potest.[49]
The fact that the chapter from which this extract is taken does not specify the Augustinian work may account for the omission of a more specific indication of its source. The text is contained in the chapter transcribed above (No. 4): Neque enim quia incontinentia . . . peccatum esse non potest. The author of

---

[38] *SMA*, fol. 53^{vb}. *De Bono conj.*, 6, 6; CSEL 41, 195: Conjugalis enim concubitus generandi gratia non habet culpam; concupiscentiae vero satiandae, sed tamen cum conjuge, propter thori fidem, venialem habet culpam.

[39] *DDf*, 364.

[40] *SA*, 132.

[41] *SMA*, fol. 53^{va}. *De Bono conj.*, 6, 6; CSEL 41, 194.

[42] *DDf*, 365.

[43] *SMA*, fol. 54^{ra}. Perhaps it should read: sed tamen non sit nimius, ut impediat. . . . Cf. *Sic et Non*, 130; PL 178, 1560D. *Sent.* IV, 31, 5; p. 941. *De Bono conj.*, 10, 11; CSEL 41, 202.

[44] *SA*, 132.

[45] *SMA*, fol. 53^{ra}. *De Bono conj.*, 3, 3-4, 4; CSEL 41, 190.

[46] *SA*, 132.

[47] *SA*, 133.

[48] *SMA*, fol. 52^{rb}. *De Bono viduitatis*, 3, 4-4, 5; CSEL 44, 308 f. Cf. *Sent.* IV, 31, 5; p. 939. *Summa sent.* VII, 3; PL 176, 156A.

[49] *SA*, 133.

DDf had this text in mind when he wrote: Quod Augustinus removet dicens: Non quia libido . . . excusabile fit illud malum.[50]

(19) Idem: Concubitum qui non fit causa prolis . . . mulierem et caetera.[51]
Again we are confronted here with the transcription of an entire chapter from the *SMA* of which we have quoted the introductory sentence: Concubitum . . . contra naturam est (No. 15).[52] The whole chapter is found in Hugh of St. Victor.[53]

(20) Augustinus in *Enchiridion*: Posset putari . . . debitoribus nostris.[54]
From beginning to end this excerpt is identical with a chapter in the *SMA*.[55]

(21) Augustinus: Propter fornicationis vitandum malum . . . ignosci faciunt per se.[56]
The *SMA* also omits a specific reference to the Augustinian work from which the text is derived. The writer of the *SA* copied the complete chapter from the *SMA*.[57]

(22) Augustinus in libro *De Virginitate*: Nec peccatum . . . constituimus.[58]
In the *SMA* the chapter from which this passage is copied bears the heading: *Augustinus in libro De Virginibus*.[59] The author of DDf made use of this excerpt when he stated: Augustinus: Conjugium bonum est, conjugalis pudicitia donum Dei est, quae tamen infra virginalem et vidualem pudicitiam est.[60] As transcribed by the compiler of the *SMA* the corresponding text should read: Non peccatum dicimus esse nuptias et tamen non solum infra virginalem verum etiam infra vidualem continentiam constituimus.[61] We shall find later (No. 48) that the remark: conjugalis pudicitia donum Dei est, is likewise based on a text found in both the *SA* and *SMA*.

(23) Idem: Bonae sunt nuptiae . . . spiritualiter.[62]
We can supply the full text from its source, the *SMA*, which reads: Idem: Bonae sunt nuptiae et contra omnes calumnias sana ratione possunt defendi. In quibus tanto meliores sunt conjugati quanto castius et fidelius Deum timent, maxime si filios nutriant spiritualiter.[63]

(24) Tantum bonum . . . vidualis.
As found in the *SMA*, the full quotation reads: Tantum est bonum fidelis conjugii, ut etiam membra sint Christi. Hoc autem bono melius est bonun continentiae vidualis.[64]

(25) Idem: Vitia . . . sed per id quod eis juxtapositum est.[65]
Although this text dates back to St. Isidore, the writer of the *SA* followed his source which stated: Idem: . . . Vitia . . . quod eis juxtapositum est.[66] A free version of part of this passage occurs in the *DDf* whose author claims: Unde Augustinius: Vitia . . . quae circa ea sunt, mala sunt . . . Et item: Unusquisque . . . quae circa ipsa sunt.[67]

---

[50] *DDf*, 363.

[51] *SA*, 133.

[52] *SMA*, fol. 54ra. *De Bono conj.*, 10, 11-11, 13; CSEL 41, 202-205.

[53] *De Sacramentis* II, 11, 9; PL 176, 496C. Cf. *Sent.* IV, 31, 7; p. 941.

[54] *SA*, 133. *Enchiridion*, 78, 21; PL 40, 269.

[55] *SMA*, fol. 57ra.

[56] *SA*, 133.

[57] *SMA*, fol. 56^{vb}. *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 14, 16; PL 44, 423.

[58] *SA*, 133.

[59] *SMA*, fol. 55ra. *De Sancta virg.*, 12, 12 and 21, 21; CSEL 41, 244 and 356.

[60] *DDf*, 364.

[61] *SMA*, fol. 55ra. *De Sancta virg.*, 21, 21; CSEL 41, 256.

[62] *SA*, 134.

[63] *SMA*, fol. 55va. *De Bono conj.*, 20, 24 and 19; CSEL 41, 418 and 417. Cf. Jonas of Orléans, *De Instit. laicali* II. 1; PL 106, 167C. Abelard, *Sic et Non*, 130; PL 178, 1561B.

[64] *SA*, 134. *SMA*. fol. 49^{vb}. Cf. Augustine, *De Sancta virg.*, 19. 19; CSEL 41, 253.

[65] *SA*, 134. Cf. *DDf*, 379.

[66] *SMA*, fol. 53ra. Isidore, *Sent.* II. 40, 14; PL 83, 645A Cf. Jonas of Orléans. *De Inst. laicali* II. 1; PL 106, 169AB.

[67] *DDf*, 364.

(26) Idem: Nuptiarum bonum . . . excusari.

In the *SMA* the full texts reads: Item: Nuptiarum malo originali, quod inde trahitur, non potest excusari: sicut adulteriorum (et) fornicationum malum bono naturali, quod inde nascitur, non potest excusari.[68]

(27) Augustinus: Id bonum quod habent nuptiae . . . pravitas.[69]

This extract will be found in the previous (No. 4) transcription of the chapter from which it was copied.

(28) Augustinus *De Virginitate*: Habeant . . . non violant.

This text is the first part of the chapter discussed in No. 22 of this list and reads in the *SMA*: Augustinus in libro *De Virginibus*: Habeant connubia bonum suum, non quia filios procreant sed quia licite, quia pudice procreant et procreatos salubriter educant, quia thori fidem invicem servant, quia sacramentum conjugii non violant.[70]

(29) Augustinus *ad Valerium*: Non tantum fecunditas . . . inter Christum et ecclesiam.

The compiler of the *SMA* introduced this excerpt with *In eodem* which the author of the *SA* replaced with the previous and, in a way, accurate title: Augustinus *ad Valerium*.[71]

(30) Dicit Augustinus quaedam bona conjugii omnibus esse communia, sacramenti sanctitatem, quae et res sacramenti dicitur, populo Dei i.e. solis fidelibus.

This somewhat vague reference is based on a chapter in the *SMA* which begins thus: Bonum nuptiarum per omnes gentes atque omnes homines in causa generandi est et in fide castitatis. Quod autem ad populum Dei pertinet, etiam in sanctitate est sacramenti.[72] The entire chapter is quoted in the *SA* as listed under the next number. In the *SMA*, as preserved in the Vatican manuscript, the following nonsensical title is prefixed to it: Item de VII conjugiis.

(31) Augustinus: Bonum nuptiarum . . . adhaeserunt. Et post: Manet . . . auferre sicut anima apostata . . . non potest amittere.[73]

This is the first text which cannot be fully accounted for by our Vatican version of the *SMA* because it ends with *auferre*.[74] The missing part might perhaps be derived from Ivo's *Panormia*,[75] but his collection does not account for the first and larger section of this long quotation. The author of the *DDf* had this chapter before his eyes when he remarked: Unde Augustinus: Manet inter conjugatos quoddam vinculum quod nec separatio localis nec cum altero copulatio separare potest.[76] Or: Unde Augustinus: Sacramento semel accepto numquam aliquis carebit.[77] Or: Et item: Ordinatio clericorum, quae fit ad congregandam plebem, etsi ille effectus non sequitur, ordinatio tamen permanet.[78]

---

[68] *SA*, 134. *SMA*, fol. 50^{va}. *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 1, 1; PL 44, 413.

[69] *SMA*, fol. 49^{vb}. Cf. Hincmar, *Ep. XXII;* PL 126, 140A. *DDf*, 365.

[70] *SA*, 134. *SMA*, fol. 55^{ra}. *De Sancta virg.*, 12, 12; CSEL, 41, 244.

[71] *SA*, 134. *SMA*, fol. 56^{ra}. *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 10, 11; PL 44, 420. The work is addressed to Valerius. Cf. Hincmar, *Ep. XXII;* PL 126, 138C.

[72] *SA*, 135. *SMA*, fol. 50^{va}. *De Bono conj.*, 29, 32; CSEL 41, 226. Cf. *DDf*, 371: Sacramenta communia sunt omnibus, res sacramenti solis fidelibus committitur. See also the variant cited in *DDf*, 367: Et hoc est quod dicit Augustinus quaedam bona conjugii omnibus debent esse communia; sacramenti sanctitatem, quae et res sacramenti dicitur, populo Dei, i.e. solis fidelibus.

[73] *SA*, 135.

[74] *SMA*, fol. 50^{va}. *De Bono conj.*, 29, 32; CSEL 41, 226. *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 10, 11; PL 44, 420.

[75] *Pan.* VI, 74; *Decr.* VIII, 12 f.; PL 161, 1258C; 586BC. Cf. Abelard, *Sic et Non*, 126; PL 178, 1552CD: Item, *De Nupt. et conc.* lib. I: Usque adeo . . . regenerationis accepit.

[76] *DDf*, 365 and 374. The adjective *localis* is not found in the *SMA*. Cf. Ivo of Chartres, *Epp. CXXII* and *CXXV;* PL 162, 135B and 137B.

[77] *DDf*, 366.

[78] *Ibid.*

(32) Augustinus: Sacramentum, inquit, quod nec separati . . . fuerat copulatum.[79]

In the *SMA* this chapter reads: Idem: Sacramentum quod nec separati nec adulterati conjuges amittunt, concorditer casteque custodiant. Solum est enim quod etiam sterile conjugium tenet ea spe fecunditatis amissa propter quam fuerat copulatum.[80]

(33) Augustinus *De Virginitate*: Antiquis justis . . . erat prohibitum.[81]

This entire chapter is also found in Hugh of St. Victor who introduces it with: Idem in libro *De Virginibus*.[82] It corresponds to the heading in the *SMA*: Augustinus in libro *De Virginibus*.[83] The author of the *DDf* transcribed the text in his own free manner.[84]

(34) In eodem: Sicut non est impar . . . oportuit.[85]

In the *SMA* this chapter also follows immediately upon the excerpt discussed in No. 33. Instead of *In eodem* Hugh of St. Victor introduces the same text with *Item idem*.[86] In the treatise *DDf* the text is changed and shortened.[87]

(35) Idem: (Apostolus) Justus quamvis . . . venialis ille concubitus.

With the exception of the interpolation (*Apostolus*) the entire chapter is found in the *SMA*[88] where it is introduced too by the plain *Idem*. Hugh of St. Victor, who cites the text in the same sequence, does not have the interpolation.[89] The author of the *DDf* abbreviated the chapter.[90]

(36) Item: Antiquis temporibus . . . sed ferunt.[91]

In the *SMA* this text constitutes two separate chapters. Since the entire text is published in the *SA* we are in a position to clarify the sentence which caused Bliemetzrieder to criticize his author's *"nicht glückliche"* abbreviation of the Augustinian wording. Owing to a scribal error caused by a homoteleuton the following part is missing in the *SA*: (. . . concedit Apostolus). Habebant enim eas in opere generandi, non in morbo desiderii. In eodem: Quod praecepit Apostolus (conjugatis, hoc est nuptiarum. Quod autem . . . ferunt).[92] It would be interesting to know whether the omission originated in the collection used by the author of the SA or in the transcription of his work. Hugh of St. Victor cites only the first of the two chapters.[93]

(37) Unde Augustinus: Sacramentum nuptiarum temporis nostri . . . necessarium.[94]

The compiler of the *SMA*[95] may have copied the text from Ivo's *Panormia* where it consists of two separate chapters.[96] However, in the *SMA* the passage is preceded by: Idem: Plures feminae ab uno viro fetari possunt, una vero a pluribus non potest.[97] Since this sentence is taken from the same context in Augustine, it is more likely that the entire chapter goes back to a different source. In making use of the excerpt, the author of the *DDf* made an interpolation: (Sacramentum vero nuptiarum nostri temporis, ut dicit Augustinus, sic . . . censuerat.) Quod in paradiso ideo inter duos institutum fuit, ut ab initio nuptiarum honestum sumeretur exemplum. Sin autem mortua una quilibet aliam duxerit, non impedit (ad bonae vitae remedium sed ad ecclesiastici ordinis necessarium signaculum).[98]

---

[79] *SA*, 135.

[80] *SMA*, fol. 51^{rb}. *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 17, 19; PL 44, 424.

[81] *SA*, 136.

[82] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 10; PL 176, 497A.

[83] *SMA*, fol. 54^{vb}.

[84] *DDf*, 367.

[85] *SA*, 136.

[86] *SMA*, fol. 54^{vb}. *De Sacr.* II, 11, 10; PL 176, 497B.

[87] *DDf*, 367.

[88] *SA*, 136. *Phil.* i, 23. *SMA*, fol. 55^{rb}. *De Bono conj.*, 15, 17 and 16, 18; CSEL 41, 210 f.

[89] *De Sacr.* II 11, 10; PL 176, 497BC. *Sent.* IV, 38, 1; ed. Quaracchi, p. 950.

[90] *DDf*, 367: Sicut enim aliquis justus cupiens dissolvi . . . ita illi non cupiditate libidinis sed officio generandi pluribus se conjungebant. The first part of the sentence goes back to the chapter listed under No. 35, while the second part (ita illi . . .) is an adaptation of: Justi officio propagandi nuptias contrahebant, non victi libidine, which occurs in the chapter listed under No. 36.

[91] *SA*, 136.

[92] *SMA*, fol. 54va. *De Bono conj.*, 13, 15; CSEL 41, 207 f.

[93] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 10; PL 176, 496D: Antiquis temporibus . . . in morbo desiderii.

[94] *SA*, 136.

[95] *SMA*, fol. 51va.

[96] *Pan.* VI, 65 f.; PL 161, 1257A. *De Bono conj.*, 18, 21; CSEL 41, 214.

[97] *De Bono conj.*, 17, 20; CSEL 41, 213.

(38) Idem *ad Valerium*: Patres sancti Abraham . . . naturam.[99]

This extract is part of a chapter quoted above (No. 11) beginning with: Augustinus *ad Valerium*: Motum inoboedientem . . .[1]

(39) Augustinus *De Bono viduitatis*: Deus maculinum . . . monstravit.[2]

This text is found in Ivo's *Panormia* under the heading: Augustinus *Contra advers. legis.*[3] In the *SMA* it is introduced by *Item.* In trying to offer a more specific source, the author of the *SA* saw that the third excerpt prior to this text had the heading: Augustinus *De Bono viduitatis.* This explains his wrong attribution.

(40) Item: Non damno bigamos . . . octogamos.[4]

The false implication that this sentence dates back to St. Augustine was not the fault of the author of the *SA* who simply copied it as he found it in the *SMA*. There it follows also in the sequence given by the *SA*.[5] If he had used Ivo's *Panormia* where this text is part of a longer chapter, he would have noted its true source: Hieronymus *ad Pamachium.*[6] Bliemetzrieder concludes from this false attribution: "Hier ist wohl der Beweiss erbracht, dass auch der Verfasser von SA nach Excerpten-Sammlungen arbeitete."[7] This was indeed much more the case than Bliemetzrieder realized. The author of the *DDf* also erred in his attribution: Augustinus non prohibet dicens: Non damno digamum . . . octogamum.[8]

(41) Item: Ego libera voce . . . marito.[9]

Here again the author of the *SA* simply copied the next text in the *SMA*: Item: Ego libera . . . et secundo viro nubere.[10] It is part of a chapter from Ivo's *Panormia* which reads: Item: Ego nunc libera . . . secundo marito nubere.[11]

(42) Item: De tertiis . . . auferre.[12]

In the Vatican copy of the *SMA* this chapter reads: Augustinus *De Bona viduitate*: De tertiis . . . auferre.[13] Since the author of the *SA* had already made use of this attribution (No. 39), he could here dispense with it.

(43) Item: Abraham post . . . aliam ducere.[14]

This text agrees verbatim with the *SMA*[15] whose author had abbreviated it from a longer chapter in Ivo's *Panormia.*[16]

---

[98] *DDf*, 367. Read *meritum* instead of *remedium.* The interpolated text is based on a passage in the *SMA* beginning with: Sic patres sancti (fol. 56^{ra}), partly quoted by Hugh of St. Victor, *De Sacr.* II, 11, 10; PL 176, 497A.

[99] *SA*, 136. *SMA*, fol. 59^{vb}. *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 8, 9; CSEL 41, 419.

[1] See No. 11.

[2] *SA*, 136 f. *SMA*, fol. 59^{vb}. It reads: Deus qui masculum . . . monstravit.

[3] *Pan.* VI, 61; PL 161, 1255D.

[4] *SA*, 137.

[5] *SMA*, fol. 59^{vb}.

[6] *Pan.* VI. 62; PL 161, 1256B.

[7] *SA*, 137, note 1.

[8] *DDf*, 368.

[9] *SA*, 137.

[10] *SMA*, fol. 60^{ra}.

[11] *Pan.* VI, 62; PL 161, 1256B. Abelard, *Sic et Non*, 129; PL 178, 1559C: Ego nunc . . . desinat prostituta.

[12] *SA*, 137.

[13] *SMA*, fol. 59^{va}. *Pan.* VI, 59; PL 161, 1255B: Augustinus *De Bon. viduit.*

[14] *SA*, 137. The text: Nec contra humanae . . . audeo damnare (*SA*, 137) is copied from *SMA*, fol. 59^{vb}. Cf. *DDf*, 368.

[15] *SMA*, fol. 59^{vb}.

[16] *Pan.* VI. 60; PL 161, 1255C.

(44) In Neocaesariensi Concilio: Presbyterum . . . consensum?[17]

Both the *Panormia*[18] and the *SMA*[19] present this canon. In slightly altered form it is also cited in the treatise *DDf*.[20]

(45) Unde Hieronymus *Super Osee* libro I: Non est culpandus . . . non habuit.[21]

The Vatican manuscript of the *SMA* states only: Hieronymus *super Osee* librum: Non est culpandus . . . non habebat.[22] But it is quite probable that the copy used by the author of the *SA* stated specifically that the text came from the first book of the commentary.[23] The author of the *DDf* took his usual liberty in transcribing the passage.[24]

(46) *Constitutio Novellarum*: Princeps . . . nullus prohibeat.[25]

In the *SMA* this extract also follows immediately upon Jerome's text.[26] The compiler who abbreviated the passage from a longer text in Ivo's *Panormia*[27] made the addition: et nullus prohibeat. This accounts for its appearance in the *SA*.

(47) Ambrosius: Non est ratum conjugium praeter Deum et ideo non est peccatum dimisisse propter Deum, si alii conjungatur. Augustinus dicit: Dimisso propter Deum non est peccatum, si alii conjungatur. Injuria enim Creatoris solvit matrimonii jus.[28]

These two quotations do not occur in the *SMA*. They are cited here together because in reality they are one.

It was neither Ambrose nor Augustine, but rather Ambrosiaster who originated the controversy stirred up by his statement: Non enim ratum est matrimonium quod sine Dei devotione est. Ac per hoc non est peccatum ei, qui dimittitur propter Deum, si alii se junxerit. Contumelia enim Creatoris solvit jus matrimonii circa eum qui relinquitur.[29] Without indicating its source, the *Glossa ordinaria* asserts: Non est ratum conjugium quod sine Dei devotione est. Et ideo non est peccatum ei, qui dimittit propter Deum, si alii se *copulaverit*.[30] Although this transcription is fairly accurate, there is no doubt that the confusion had its origin in some commentary on the first Epistle to the Corinthians. Lombard, who quotes a long Ambrosiaster text containing the excerpt we have cited,[31] remarks: Nota quod Ambrosius sibi contradicere videtur. Supra enim dicit quod si fidelis dimittens infidelem alii copulaverit se, adulter est. Hic vero dicit quod ei *dimisso non est peccatum si alii se copulaverit*. Quod a quibusdam sic determinatur . . .[32] Lombard, of course, could not have started the confusion, but his wording (dimisso non est peccatum si alii se copulaverit) shows clearly how the allegedly Augustinian text was arrived at. The explanatory distinctions which follow in Lombard's commentary[33] reflect some very lively discussion on the subject. In the course of these debates the original Ambrosiaster, commonly known as Ambrosius, was divided into two i.e. Ambrose and Augustine.[34] The author of the treatise *DDf* made his customary changes and additions: Ambrosius: Non est ratum conjugium praeter Deum, *i.e. praeter fidem Dei*, et ideo *dimisso fideli* propter Deum ab infideli non est peccatum, si alii copulatur. Et Augustinus: Dimisso propter Deum non est peccatum, si alii copulatur. Injuria enim Creatoris solvit jus matrimonii.[35]

---

[17] *SA*, 137.

[18] *Pan.* VI, 67; PL 161, 1257B.

[19] *SMA*, fol. 63^{ra}.

[20] *DDf*, 368.

[21] *SA* 137.

[22] *SMA*, fol. 61^{rb}.

[23] Cf. Ivo, *Decr.* VIII, 38 and *Pan.* VI, 57; PL 161, 592A and 1255A.

[24] *DDf*, 368.

[25] *SA*, 137.

[26] *SMA*, fol. 61^{vb}.

[27] *Pan.* VI, 58; PL 161, 1256A.

[28] *SA*, 137. According to the *Liber Pancrisis*, as quoted by F. Bliemetzrieder, "Pièces inédites d'Anselme de Laon", *RTAM*, II (1930), 68, Anselm of Laon wrote: Super hoc (*I Cor.* vii, 12-15) Augustinus: Non est peccatum dimissum (*read* dimisso) propter Deum, si alii se copulaverit.

[29] *In I Cor.* vii, 15; PL 17, 231B. Cf. Hincmar, *Ep. XXII;* PL 126, 141D.

[30] *In I Cor.* vii, 15; PL 114, 530B. Abelard, *Sic et Non*, 125; PL 178, 1546D.

[31] *In I Cor.* vii, 15; PL 191, 1593C. Cf. *Sent.* IV, 39, 5; p. 976.

[32] PL 191, 1593D. Cf. *Sent.* IV, 39, 5; p. 976.

[33] PL 191, 1593D. The name Augustinus is entirely out of place there. See also *Sent.* IV, 39, 5; p. 977.

[34] Compare the following attributions: Lombard, *In I Cor.* vii, 12; PL 191, 1292A: Augustinus: Non imputandum matrimonium quod extra decretum Dei factum est. *Summa sent.* VII, 8; PL 176, 161B: Dicit Ambrosius non debere matrimonium imputari quod extra Dei decretum est. Gratian, *Decr.* C. 28, qu. 1, c. 14 dictum: Item illud Ambrosii: Non est imputandum. . . . Accordingly, Lombard, *Sent.* IV, 39, 3; p. 974 wrote:

We may also add that Hugh of St. Victor attributes the second text to Gregory in a similar enumeration: Beatus Ambrosius dicit: Non est ratum conjugium praeter Deum et ideo non est peccatum dimissio propter Deum, si alii copuletur. Item beatus Gregorius dicit: Dimissio propter Deum non est peccatum, si alii conjungatur. Injuria enim Creatoris solvit jus matrimonii.[36]

(48) . . . Augustini dicentis *ad Valerium*: Pudicitia conjugalis donum Dei . . . Deo placere.[37]

With this long passage we return to the *SMA*: Augustinus *ad Valerium*: Pudicitia donum Dei est. Quid ergo dicemus . . . Deo placere.[38] It contains the sentence: Copulatio autem maris et feminae generandi causa bonum est nuptiarum naturale. Sed isto bono male utitur qui bestialiter utitur, ut sit ejus intentio in voluptate libidinis, non in voluntate propaginis. Hoc tam evidens bonum cum (in)fideles habent, quia infideliter utuntur, in peccatum convertitur.[39] The writer of *DDf* had this passage in front of him when he stated: Augustinus: Copulatio maris et feminae . . . quia infideliter utuntur.[40] The same author claims: Item de eodem: Conjugio per conjugium peccata non coercentur sed peccata peccatis vincuntur.[41] To this corresponds the sentence in the same chapter of the *SMA*: Cum igitur hoc faciunt . . . non peccata coercentur sed aliis peccatis peccata cumulantur.[42]

(49) Idem *ad Pollentium*: Quia enim conjux fidelis . . . ne impedimentum daret evangelio.

In the *SMA*, as preserved in the Vatican manuscript, this text is attached to a lengthy commentary on *I Cor.* vii, 12, attributed to Augustinus in libro primo *De Sermone Domini in monte*. It is followed by: Item *ad Pollentium*: Monet ergo Apostolus . . . ne impedimentum daret evangelio.[43] There are other instances to show that chapter headings in the Vatican manuscript are misplaced and we may rightly assume that the author of *SA* used a copy where the introduction: Item *ad Pollentium* was still in its correct place. The fact that in both works the passage ends with *ne impedimentum daret evangelio* proves that the author of the *SA* did not use Ivo's *Panormia*. There the same chapter ends with: *ne quod impedimentum demus evangelio Christi.*[44]

(50) Item: Cum ergo coepisset . . . jussioni.[45]

Here again comparison is very difficult because the text is heavily abbreviated in the edition of the *SA*. Since the whole passage is found in the *SMA*,[46] there is no reason to assume that the author of the *SA* used Ivo's *Panormia*.[47] This

---

Ambrosius: Non est imputandum. . . . See also Gratian, *Decr.* C. 28, qu. 1 c. 17 dictum: Item illud Augustini: Non est ratum conjugium quod sine Deo est.

[35] *DDf*, 369. See also the *Sententiae Berolinenses;* ed. F. Stegmüller, *RTAM*, XI (1939), 59: Item dicit beatus Ambrosius: Si quis infidelis odio Dei ab infideli discedit, fidelis non est reus soluti matrimonii. Major enim est causa Dei quam causa hominum vel matrimonii. Et paulo post: Contumelia Creatoris solvit jus matrimonii. Item dicit Augustinus: Non est vera amicitia cum conjuge infidelis hominis.

[36] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 13; PL 176, 506C.

[37] *SA*, 138.

[38] *SMA*, fol. 68^{vb}. Compiled from *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 3, 3-4, 5; CSEL 41, 413-416. With the exception of the introductory sentence (Pudicitia conjugalis donum Dei est) the entire chapter is also quoted by Abelard, *Sic et Non*, 125; PL 178, 1549AC: Quid ergo dicemus . . . Deo placere (abbreviated).

[39] *SMA*, fol. 69^{br}.

[40] *DDf*, 370.

[41] *Ibid.*

[42] *SMA*, fol. 69ra. St. Augustine wrote: *vincuntur.*

[43] *SA*, 138. *SMA*, fol. 67ra.

[44] *Pan.* VI, 100; PL 161, 1266B.

[45] *SA*, 138.

[46] *SMA*, fol. 67va.

[47] *Pan.* VI, 101; PL 161, 1267B. *De adult. conj.* I, 18, 20; CSEL 41, 367.

long excerpt accounts for several shorter quotations in the treatise *DDf*: Et item: Cum evangelium primum . . . permisit. Et subdit causam: Quae enim major fornicatio quam in corde.[48] Or: Dicit Augustinus: Ne in aliena caderent . . . facile solverentur.[49] Or: Et item: Discessiones fidelis . . . difficile solverentur.[50]

(51) Isidorus sic describit: Conjugium est consensus masculi et feminae individualem vitae consuetudinem retinens.[51]

Echoing Ivo's *Panormia*, the *SMA* read: Ex libro *Constitutionum*: Nuptiae sive matrimonium est viri mulierisque conjunctio individuam consuetudinem vitae continens.[52] It was on account of the word *consensus* that Isidore's version of this definition was preferred. Even in this definition the author of *DDf* failed to present a literal quotation when he wrote: Isidorus: Conjugium est consensus maris et feminae individualem vitae consuetudinem retinens.[53]

(52) Consensus enim facit conjugium, non coitus.[54]

No source is given for this statement which occurs also in the *SMA* in a chapter without chapter heading.[55] The text of the *SMA* in which the sentence is found is a corruption of a decision made by Pope Nicholas and known through Ivo's *Panormia*.[56] Attached to this decretal, Ivo quotes St. John Chrystostom as saying: Matrimonium non facit coitus sed voluntas. The author of the *SA* had some recollection of this text when he claimed: Ille qui dicit: Matrimonium non facit coitus sed voluntas.[57] If he had been more familiar with the *Panormia*, he would have named its author.

(53) Unde Ambrosius: Non defloratio virginitatis . . . pactio conjugalis.[58]

The full text of this sentence in the *SMA* is as follows: Ambrosius: Non defloratio virginitatis sed pactio conjugalis conjugium facit.[59] The very same word order is retained in the treatise *DDf*.[60]

(54) Unde Augustinus *ad Valerium*: Cur ergo . . . non coeperunt.[61]

The writer of the *SA* found this text in the *SMA* where it reads: Cur ergo conjuges maneant, qui ex consensu concubere desinunt, si manserunt conjuges Joseph et Maria, qui concubere non coeperunt?[62]

(55) Dicit Augustinus illos Christi et ecclesiae non habere sacramentum, inter quos vel per quos perhibetur non fuisse carnale commercium . . . Sed dicit rursus Augustinus: Illa mulier non potest pertinere ad matrimonium, cum qua perhibetur non fuisse commixtio sexuum . . . Sed rursus dicit auctoritas: Non est perfectum conjugium, ubi non sequitur commixtio sexuum . . . Rursus ille qui dicit: Matrimonium non facit coitus sed voluntas, hoc significavit . . .[63]

There is, as we have seen, no doubt that the compiler of the *SMA* caused or, rather, transmitted a confusion of texts in which part of the Leonine decretal[64] was reworded and attributed to St. Augustine. On the authority of his source the author of the *SA* could have attributed his third text to St. Augustine.[65] It is possible that the reason why he chose to class it as *auctoritas* was because its authenticity was questioned especially by those who refused to accept the doctrine.[66] The author of the *DDf* cites all three texts in his own way: Dicit Augustinus illos non habere sacramentum Christi et ecclesiae inter quos perhibetur commixtio sexus non fuisse. And: Dicit Augustinus: mulier non pertinet ad matrimonium cum qua non subsequitur carnale commercium. Finally: Dicit auctoritas: Non est perfectum conjugium ubi deest carnale commercium.[67]

---

[48] *DDf*, 369. *SMA*, fol. 67ra.

[49] *DDf*, 369. *SMA*, fol. 68ra.

[50] *DDf*, 370. *SMA*, fol. 68ra.

[51] *SA*, 139.

[52] *SMA*, fol. 48ra. *Pan.* VI, 1; PL 161, 1244D.

[53] *DDf*, 371.

[54] *SA*, 139.

[55] *SMA*, fol. 48^{rb}.

[56] *Pan.* VI, 107; *Decr.* VIII, 17 and 233: PL 161, 1272B; 588A; 634A. Ivo, *Epp. CXXXIV; CXLVIII; CCXLII;* PL 162, 143D; 153D; 250C.

[57] *SA*, 140.

[58] *SA*, 139.

[59] *SMA*, fol. 48^{rb}. Owing to some confusion with the following chapter, the scribe wrote: Ambrosius de legibus.

[60] *DDf*, 371.

[61] *SA*, 139.

[62] *SMA*, fol. 56va. *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 12, 13; PL 44, 422.

[63] *SA*, 139 f. *SMA*, fol. 58ra. According to F. Bliemetzrieder, "Gratian und die Schule Anselms von Laon", 52, the author quotes here from memory: "Eine freie Sentenz aus dem Gedächtniss." In reality, the author followed the *SMA*.

[64] Leo, *Ep. CLXVII*, 4 to Rusticus of Narbonne; PL 54, 1204B. Cf. *Coll. can. hispana;* PL 84, 766C. Hincmar, *Ep. XXII;* PL 126, 137B. Ivo, *Pan.* VI, 23; PL 161, 1248AB.

[65] In the *SA*, 149, it is attributed to Augustine.

(56) Evaristus papa: Aliter . . . custodiant. Item: Ita . . . vota legitima succurrerint.[68]

In Ivo's *Panormia*,[69] where the compiler of the *SMA* found this "decretal", these two texts constitute a coherent unit. The compiler divided them and it seems that what was once a marginal note became a sort of heading of the second part: . . . castitatem custodiant. Item: *Pacta legitima scitote connubia.* Aliter vero praesumpta . . . vota succurrerint legitima.[70] Although this does not explain the word *ita* in the *SA* (presumably a scribal error), it does supply the reason why the author of the *SA* proffers two separate extracts. The author of the *DDf* made use of the chapter.[71]

(57) Gregorius in *Registro* dicens: De his requisisti . . . connubia.[72] The entire text is found in the *SMA*[73] whose composer had copied it from Ivo's *Panormia.*[74]

(58) Hincmarus ostendit dicens: Si per maleficia occulto . . . .nequibunt.[75]

Again the entire passage is found in the same sequence in both the *SMA* and Ivo's *Panormia.*[76]

(59) In Concilio apud Vermeriam tempore Pippini habito: Si qua mulier . . . et illa quod vult faciat.[77]

Judging by the ending, the text is directly derived neither from Ivo's *Decretum*[78] nor his *Panormia*,[79] but from the *SMA*. The latter reads: Ex Concilio apud Warmatiam temporibus Pippini regis: Si qua mulier proclamaverit quod vir suus numquam coisset cum ea *et vir dicit quod sic vere fecerat*, exeant inde ad crucem. Et si verum fuerit, separentur et illa quod vult faciat.[80] Through a scribal error, I presume, the italicized sentence slipped into this canon from the succeeding one.[81] Unfortunately, Bliemetzrieder did not transcribe the whole canon to see whether the addition entered the *SA*.

(60) Und Augustinus *ad Pollentium*: Jussit Dominus per Esdram . . . eodem jubente.[82] A comparison with this text in the *SMA* reveals that the sentence: . . . et seducebantur et sic illae feminae per maritos saepe acquirebantur Domino, is closer to the original in the *SMA*. There it reads: . . . et seducebantur. Non illae per maritos acquirebantur Domino.[83] The title prefixed to both shows clearly enough that the author of the SA copied the entire chapter from the *SMA*.

(61) Sed dicit Augustinus: Manet inter viventes quoddam conjugale quod nec adulteratio neque cum alio copulatio potest auferre.[84]

The corresponding sentence in the *SMA* reads: Manet inter viventes quoddam conjugale quod nec separatio nec copulatio cum altero possit auferre.[85] Both Ivo's *Decretum* and his *Panormia*[86] contain the chapter in which the sentence occurs. We have already noted the reading of the *DDf*: Manet inter conjugatos quoddam vinculum quod nec separatio localis nec cum altero copulatio separare potest.[87]

---

[66] Cf. *SA*, 140: Ille qui dixit: Non est perfectum. . . .

[67] *DDf*, 371.

[68] *SA*, 140.

[69] *Pan.* VI, 31; PL 161, 1249C.

[70] *SMA*, fol. 58^{vb}.

[71] *DDf*, 371.

[72] *SA*, 141.

[73] *SMA*, fol. 71^{rb}.

[74] *Pan.* VI, 116; PL 161, 1274C. Cf. *DDf*, 372 (apparatus criticus to line 9).

[75] *SA*, 141.

[76] *SMA*, fol. 71va. *Pan.* VI, 117; PL 161, 1275A.

[77] *SA*, 141.

[78] *Decr.* VIII, 179; PL 161, 621D.

[79] *Pan.* VI, 118; PL 161, 1276A.

[80] *SMA*, fol. 71^{vb}.

[81] *SMA*, *ibid.* *Pan.* VI, 119; PL 161, 1276A. Cf. *DDf*, 373.

[82] *SA*, 141. On page 162, the editor attempts a subtle explanation of the reading *me ratio* (instead of *merito*), though it is nothing but a scribal error.

[83] *SMA*, fol. 69va. *De Adult. conj.*, 18, 20; CSEL 41, 367.

[84] *SA*, p. 143.

(62) Unde Augustinus *De Adulterinis conjugiis* in primo libro: Si propter fornicationem . . . infidelitas. Infidelis hominis . . . quae non habet veram.[88]

After comparing this excerpt with similar chapters in Ivo's *Decretum* and *Panormia*,[89] Bliemetzrieder concluded that the author of the *SA* either consulted the original work or a collection that differed from those of Ivo. The *SMA* provides the answer: Augustinus De Adulterinis conjugiis in primo libro: Si propter fornicationem carnis . . . extra fidem peccatum est,[90] quamvis fidelis habeat pudicitiam et cum infideli conjuge, quia non habet veram.[91]

(63) Idem de *Sermone Domini in Monte* libro primo: Si infidelitas . . . condemnas.[92]

In Ivo's *Panormia*[93] this text is divided into three chapters, while the *SMA* presents it as a unit.[94] Its title reads: Idem *De Sermone Domini in Monte* libro primo. Unfortunately, the edition of the *SA* furnishes only three words of this long text.

(64) Legitima conjugia, ut Hieronymus ait, tria in scripturis . . . De quarto noto conjugio Hieronymus ait: Additur . . . uxor.[95]

Although Ivo's *Decretum* and *Panormia*[96] contain both chapters, only the *SMA* accounts for the transitional phrase: De quarto *noto* conjugio instead of *legitimo* conjugio.[97] The author of the *DDf* used part of this text.[98]

(65) Gregorius Junior sic dicit de raptis puellis: De raptis puellis . . . non possunt.

The *SMA* contains the chapter: Decretum Gregorii Junioris: De puellis raptis . . . sibi vendicare non possunt.[99] In Ivo's *Decretum* and *Panormia* the chapter ends with: sibi jure vindicare nullatenus possint.[1] Both attribute it to a Council of Châlon, but the previous canon in the *Panormia* is assigned to Gregorius Junior. This explains the wrong attribution in the *SMA* and the *SA*.

(66) Propter hoc Chalcedonensis Concilii decretum in *Poenitentiali* libro sic est scriptum: Rapuisti . . . permaneas.

The chapter quoted under No. 65 contains a decree of the Council of Chalcedon.[2] This caused the author of the *SA* to substantiate his point by an alleged decree of the same Council as found in a *Penitential*: Rapuisti . . . permaneas.[3] He did not find it in the *SMA*, unless there existed a larger edition of the collection. The treatise *DDf* refers to the anathema of Gregorius Junior (No. 65) without mentioning the *Penitential*.[4]

---

[85] *SMA*, fol. 51ra.

[86] *Decr.* VIII, 13; *Pan.* VI, 74; PL 161, 586C; 1258C.

[87] *DDf*, 365 and 374.

[88] *SA*, 143.

[89] *Decr.* VIII, 247; *Pan.* VII, 28; PL 161, 638C; 1287A.

[90] Both the *Panormia* and the *Decretum* end at this point.

[91] *SMA*, fol. 76ra.

[92] *SA*, 143.

[93] *Pan.* VII. 29-31; PL 161, 1287BD. Augustine, *De Sermone Domini in Monte* I, 16, 46-47; PL 40, 1252 f.

[94] *SMA*, fol. 76ra.

[95] *SA*, 144.

[96] *Decr.* VIII, 40 f.; *Pan.* VI, 33 f.; PL 161, 592D; 1250B. Cf. H. Wasserschleben, *Die irische Kanonensammlung* (Leipzig, 1885), p. 186.

[97] *SMA*, fol. 58^{rb}. Bliemetzrieder maintains that the writer used Ivo's *Decretum* and intentionally changed *legitimo* to *noto*.

[98] *DDf*, 377.

[99] *SA*, 144. *SMA*, fol. 61^{vb}.

[1] *Decr.* VIII, 174; PL 161, 621A.

[2] *SA*, 144. Dion. Exiguus, *Cod. can. eccl.* XX, 27; PL 67, 176D: Eos qui rapiunt . . . anathematizentur. *Pan.* VI, 55; PL 161, 1254C.

[3] *Corrector Burchardi*, 46; ed. H. Wasserschleben, *Die Bussordnungen der abendl. Kirche* (Halle, 1851), p. 641. Burchard, *Decr.* XIX, 5; PL 140, 958D.

[4] *DDf*, 377.

(67) Leo quartus episcopis Brittaniae de statutis patrum custodiendis: De Libellis . . . credere.[5]

Judging by the word *credere*, indeed very little to go by, this long chapter was borrowed from Ivo's *Decretum*, not his *Panormia*.[6] The Vatican manuscript of the *SMA* does not contain it.

(68) Augustinus in *epistola ad Armentarium et Paulinam*: Quia Deo vitam piam et religiosam vovisti . . . mulier.[7]

The scribe of the Vatican manuscript wrote: Augustinus in *epistola ad Armentariam et Paulinum*: Quia Deo vitam piam et religiosam vovisti . . . mulier.[8] The first few words of the Augustinian text especially prove that the author of the *SA* copied it not from Ivo's collections[9] but from the *SMA*. The compiler of the latter changed the wording to shorten the excerpt. The writer of *DDf* had this chapter in mind when he asserted: Ait Augustinus: Alienum votum non solvatur sed temeritas corrigatur. Item: Deus non exigit alienum sed vetat.[10]

(69) Ex Concilio Remensi: Qui uxorem suam . . . convertatur.[11]

This decree is found in Ivo's collection and in the *SMA*.[12]

(70) Idem ad Ecdiciam: Non quia temperabatis . . . debuisti.[13]

Bliemetzrieder, who was convinced that the writer had Ivo's *Panormia* before him, grew quite impatient at this mediaeval use of *Idem*, implying that the text dates back to the Council of Rheims. If Bliemetzrieder had at least inserted a few more words of the text instead of his lengthy digression on mediaeval methods of quoting, we could offer more detailed proof of the writer's immediate source. In both of Ivo's collections the passage begins with Non quia *pariter* temperabatis,[14] while both the *SMA* and the *SA* read: Non quia temperabatis.[15]

(71) Unde Eugenius papa: Si vir et mulier pro religiosa vita abstinere . . . loco.[16]

Neither Ivo's *Decretum* nor his *Panormia*[17] account directly for this version, but an intermediary source whose compiler adapted the text in order to shorten it. In the *SMA* it reads: Eugenii Papae synodus: Si vir et uxor *divertere* pro religiosa vita inter se consensuerunt, nullatenus sine episcopo fiat, ut ab eo singulariter proviso constituatur loco.[18] The substitution of *abstinere* for *divertere* may have been made by the author of the *SA*.[19]

(72) Unde Augustinus *De Sermone Domini in Monte*: Si quis uxorem . . . sustineat.[20]

These four words do not allow us to make use of the variants between the text in Ivo's collections[21] and the reading in the *SMA*[22] to show that the *SA* copied from the latter. The treatise *DDf* is not reliable enough to make a useful comparison.[23]

(73) Hieronymus: Stultus est . . . retinet.[24]

This scriptural sentence[25] occurs in an extract from St. Jerome found in all three collections where it reads: Qui adulteram tenet, stultus et impius est.[26]

---

[5] *SA*, 145.

[6] *Decr.* IV, 72; *Pan.* II, 118; PL 161, 283D; 1110D.

[7] *SA*, 145.

[8] *SMA*, fol. 64^{rb}.

[9] *Decr.* VIII, 137; *Pan.* VI, 81; PL 161, 614C; 1260D.

[10] *DDf*, 377.

[11] *SA*, 145.

[12] *Decr.* VIII, 184; *Pan.* VI, 82; PL 161, 622D; 1261B. *SMA*, fol. 65^{ra} (copied from the *Panormia*).

[13] *SA*, 145.

[14] *Decr.* VIII, 136; *Pan.* VI. 80; PL 161, 614A; 1260B.

[15] *SMA*, fol. 64^{rb}.

[16] *SA*, 145.

[17] *Decr.* VIII, 127; *Pan.* VI, 76; PL 161, 612B; 1259A.

[18] *SMA*, fol. 63^{rb}.

[19] The verb *divertere* occurs also in Ivo's transcription of this decree.

[20] *SA*, 145.

[21] *Decr.* VIII, 238; *Pan.* VI, 104; PL 161, 635C; 1271C.

[22] *SMA*, fol. 70^{rb}.

[23] *DDf*, 378.

[24] *SA*, 146.

[25] *Prov.* xviii, 12.

[26] *Decr.* VIII, 43; *Pan.* VII, 7; PL 161, 593C;

The treatise *DDf* states: Dicit Hieronymus: Impius et stultus est, qui adulteram retinet.[27]

(74) . . . verba esse Gregorii: Quae posuistis, si mulier infirmitate . . . excludit.[28]
The passage is contained in the *Panormia* and in the *Decretum* of Ivo of Chartres and in both collections it begins with the words: *Quae proposuisti.*[29] It is not contained in the Vatican edition of the *SMA*. The author of *SA* denies the authenticity of the passage.

(75) Ex Concilio Gabilonensi: Dictum est . . . dominorum.[30]
All three collections present this decree.[31]

(76) Ex decretis Julii papae: Si quis ancillam . . . non dubitamus.[32]
It seems that the compiler of the *SMA* copied this decree from Ivo's *Decretum*,[33] because the *Panormia* text is longer and divided into two canons.[34]

(77) Ex Concilio Matiscensi: Si servum . . . non solvantur.[35]
In all three collections this conciliar decision ends with *solvuntur.*[36]

(78) Ex Concilio apud Vermeriam, cui interfuit Pippinus rex, capitulo sexto: Si quis ingenuus . . . debet.[37]
The unusually long introduction which points to Ivo's *Decretum*[38] reads in the *SMA*[39] as follows: Ex Concilio apud Warmatiam, cui interfuit Pippinus rex, capitulo septimo. Bliemetzrieder notes that his manuscript reads: apud Venantiam . . . capitulo septimo. However, he changed this to *capitulo sexto* simply because of Ivo's *Panormia.*[40]

Despite the variant "Venantiam," I would maintain that the author of the *SA* used the *SMA*.

(79) Ex Concilio Triburiensi: Quidam ingenuus . . . accepit.[41]
Bliemetzrieder noted that this canon, as found in both collections of Ivo, should begin with the words: Perlatum est . . . quod fecerit,[42] while his manuscript offered the reading: Quidam ingenuus . . . fecit, quaesitum est, utrum . . . The textual changes were made by the author of the *SMA.*[43]

(80) Dicit enim Leo papa quod si quis adulteratus fuit cum aliqua, non licet ei postea eam ducere uxorem, etiam mortuo viro. Non enim potest matrimonium esse, cum qua fuit adulterium.[44]
Although the author repeats this text verbatim on a later occasion[45] and the *Sententiae Attrebatenses*[46] offer an almost identical version of it, it would seem that only the last sentence can be traced back to a canonical text. Apparently another author was aware of this; this may explain a more authentic text in the treatise *DDf*: Leo Papa: Non convenit christianae religioni, ut ullus ducat in matrimonium, quam prius polluit per adulterium.[47] Its source was Ivo's *Panormia.*[48]

1280D. *SMA*, fol. 74^{rb} reads: Qui enim adulteram. . . . The text is attributed to Johannes Chrysostomus *Super Matthaeum* by Maître Simon, *Tract. de sacramentis;* ed. H. Weisweiler (Louvain, 1937), p. 59.

[27] *DDf*, 378.

[28] *SA*, 146.

[29] *Decr.* VIII, 78; *Pan.* VI, 112; PL 161, 600C; 1273C.

[30] *SA*, 146.

[31] *Decr.* VIII, 167; *Pan.* VI, 40; PL 161, 619C; 1252A. *SMA*, fol. 60^{va}.

[32] *SA*, 146.

[33] *Decr.* VIII, 156; PL 161, 618B. *SMA*, fol. 60^{rb}.

[34] *Pan.* VI, 37 f.; PL 161, 1251B.

[35] *SA*, 146.

[36] *Decr.* VIII, 157; *Pan.* VI, 39; PL 161, 618C; 1252A.

[37] *SA*, 146.

[38] *Decr.* VIII, 164; PL 161, 619B. Cf. *Pan.* VI, 41; PL 161, 1252B.

[39] *SMA*, fol. 60^{vb}.

[40] *Pan.* VI, 41; PL 161, 1252B.

[41] *SA*, 146.

[42] *Decr.* VIII, 212; *Pan.* VI, 99; PL 161, 628B; 1265D.

[43] *SMA*, fol. 66^{va}.

[44] *SA*, 146.

[45] *SA*, 148.

[46] *Sent. Attrebatenses*, 15; ed. O. Lottin, *RTAM*, X (1938), 353: Leo papa dicit quod si quis adulteratus fuerit cum aliqua, non licet postea ei eam ducere uxorem, etiam mortuo viro; non enim potest esse matrimonium cum qua prius fuerit adulterium.

[47] *DDf*, 377.

[48] *Pan.* VII, 11; PL 161, 1281D.

In the *SMA*, as preserved in the Vatican manuscript, we find only a similar text: Ex Concilio apud Alpheum habito: Definimus ut nullus ei matrimonio jungatur quam prius polluit adulterio.[49]

(81) Augustinus vero dicit quod potest.[50]

The conflicting views attributed to St. Leo and St. Augustine had probably been so often discussed that the knowledge of Augustine's wording could be taken for granted. The *Liber Pancrisis* words the opposed theories as follows: Leo Papa dicit: Nullus potest illam sibi jungere in matrimonio, quam polluit adulterio. Augustinus dicit: Licet inter illos legitimum fieri conjugium, inter quos fuit prius adulterium.[51] A more specific claim is made in the *Summa sententiarum*: Unde Leo: Non potest esse matrimonium, cum qua fuit adulterium . . . Augustinus ita dicens in lib. *De Nuptiis et concupiscentia*: Denique mortuo viro, cum (quo) verum connubium fuit, fieri (verum) connubium potest, cum quo prius adulterium fuit.[52] This authentic text reveals that St. Augustine's view was accurately recorded, though this particular passage is not contained in any of the three collections.

(82) Ex Concilio Gabilonensi: Dictum est nobis . . . non separetur.[53]

All three collections contain this decision,[54] but as recorded by Ivo the text begins: Dictum *etiam* nobis est, while both the *SMA* and the *SA* begin: Dictum est nobis.

(83) Ex Concilio Magutiensi: Si autem conjuges legitimi . . . maneant.[55]

Both the *Decretum* and *Panormia* contain a longer text of this passage, beginning with: De eo quod interrogasti.[56] The author of the *SMA* dispensed with the introduction and began with: Si filiolam . . . Si autem conjuges legitimi . . . *maneant*. In Ivo's collections the text continues: Et si supravixerit praevaricator conjugii, acerrima poenitentia mulctetur et sine spe conjugii *maneat*.

(84) In *Poenitentiali* tamen libro sic scriptum est: Tenuisti . . . in Domino.[57]

This is the second time we meet with a text from a *Penitential*, known today as *Corrector Burchardi*.[58] The passage does not occur in our manuscript of the *SMA*.

(85) Ex epistola Gregorii papae ad Innocentium: De virginibus non velatis . . . non poterit et caetera.[59]

In the Migne edition of Ivo's *Panormia* the chapter which contains this text lacks a title,[60] while the corresponding chapter in Ivo's *Decretum* bears the heading: Ex epistola s. Gregorii papae missa ad Bonifacium.[61] The variant *ad Innocentium* may point to a different collection, but it is not contained in the *SMA*.

(86) Juxta illud Augustini: Non est perfectum conjugium, ubi non sequitur commixtio sexuum.[62]

If the summary of the marriage treatise where this attribution to Augustine is made was written by the same author, he must have dropped his reserve, because previously (No. 55) he assigned it merely to an *auctoritas*.

---

[49] *SMA*, fol. 74^{ra}. *Pan.* VII, 10; PL 161, 1281C.

[50] *SA*, 146. Cf. Ivo, *Epp. XVI; CXLVIII;* PL 162, 28B; 153B.

[51] F. Bliemetzrieder, "Pièces inédites d'Anselme de Laon", *RTAM*, II (1930), 69.

[52] *Summa sent.* VII, 13; PL 176, 165AB. *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 10, 11; PL 44, 420.

[53] *SA*, 147.

[54] *Pan.* VI, 65; PL 161, 1296D. *SMA*, fol. 78^{vb}. *Decr.* IX, 81; PL 161, 680C.

[55] *SA*, 147.

[56] *Decr.* IX, 82; *Pan.* VI, 66; PL 161, 680D; 1297A.

[57] *SA*, 147.

[58] *Corrector Burchardi*, 103; ed. Wasserschleben, p. 652. Burchard, *Decr.* XVII, 24; PL 140, 924A.

[59] *SA*, 147.

[60] *Pan.* III, 204; PL 161, 1178B.

[61] *Decr.* VII, 63; PL 161, 559D.

[62] *SA*, 149.

(87) Hieronymus . . . Rem novam . . . non potest.[63]
The text is also quoted in *DDf*[64] though not derived from our three collections.

(88) Unde Augustinus *De Adulterinis conjugiis libro secundo*: Quod tibi durum . . . creditur esse deletum. Item: Non erit turpis . . . non vocetur.[65]
Bliemetzrieder affirms that the author used here Ivo's *Decretum*[66] and not the *Panormia*,[67] since in the latter the second text constitutes a separate chapter. The *SMA* provides the solution: Augustinus *De Adulterinis conjugiis* libro secundo: Quod tibi durum . . . deletum. Item: Non erit turpis . . . non vocetur.[68] As in some other cases, the author of the *SA* transcribed the entire chapter as a unit although it consists of two parts joined by item.

(89) Innocentius autem papa, cujus auctoritas magna est, videtur . . . his verbis: Quae Christo . . . immortali Sponso junxerat.[69]
Without the particular reference to the great authority of Pope Innocent, the treatise *DDf* also cites this text.[70] In Ivo's *Decretum* the excerpt continues with the words: at postea ad humanas nuptias transire elegit.[71] This complete text is cited in the *Sententiae Attrebatenses.*[72] It is not recorded in the *SMA*.

Our list of sources quoted by the author of the *SA* offers convincing proof that its writer definitely used the *SMA*. This is most evident in excerpts which are not common to the *SMA* and Ivo's collections. In numerous cases we were able to show on the strength of certain variants, that the author of the *SA* must have relied on the *SMA* (rather than Ivo's collections) even for those texts that could also be found in the *Decretum* and the *Panormia* of Ivo of Chartres. It will be noted that in many instances the length of the excerpts coincides with the length of the chapters as found in the *SMA*. As a result the marriage treatise of the *SA* was considerably longer than appears to the reader who is unable to judge the length of the omissions indicated by Bliemetzrieder by dots.

Our comparisons with the treatise *DDf* show that its author did not make personal and immediate use of any collections, but based his treatise on the source material provided by the *SA*, though it may be open to discussion whether or not he used exactly the same version as published. If he did not, the difference must have been very insignificant, because all texts quoted by the author can be traced back to the published text of the *SA*.[73] The *DDf* only offers fewer and shorter texts most of which reveal that the writer was less concerned about the actual wording than the meaning of his so-called quotations.

The author of the *SA* did not exclusively rely on the *SMA*. The two texts attributed to Ambrose and Augustine (No. 47) which, as we have seen, are but one, derived from Ambrosiaster, have their probable origin in a Biblical commentary. Two texts (Nos. 65 and 84) are attributed to a *Penitential* which we were able to identify as the *Corrector Burchardi*. Since the author of the *DDf* does not refer to them, one may be tempted to assume that they were not contained in the version he used. But in view of the many other references and quotations omitted in the *DDf*, this argument *ex silentio* carries little weight. The text (No. 67) from a decretal of Leo IV (847-55) may have been copied from Ivo's collections. The same can be said of a decretal of Gregory (No. 85) and Innocent I (No. 89). None of our three collections contain the extract (No. 87) from a letter of St. Jerome. Compared with the number of texts directly borrowed from the *SMA*, these few additional passages show that the author of the *SA* did very little indeed to expand the source material provided by the *SMA*.

---

[63] *SA*, 150. Jerome, *Ep. LV*, 4; PL 22, 563.

[64] *DDf*, 379.

[65] *SA*, 150.

[66] *Decr*. VIII, 242; PL 161, 636BD.

[67] *Pan*. VII, 35 and 37; PL 161, 1289A and 1290A.

[68] *SMA*, fol. 77ra. Both are cited in the same order by Abelard, *Sic et Non*, 128; PL 178, 1558C.

[69] *SA*, 150.

[70] *DDf*, 379.

[71] *Decr*. VII, 17; PL 161, 549A. Cf. Abelard, *Ep. VII;* PL 178, 253B.

[72] *Sent. Attrebatenses*, 15; ed. Lottin, p. 352.

[73] The only exception seems to be *DDf*, 377: Leo papa: Non convenit . . . quam prius polluit per adulterium. *Pan*. VII, 11; PL 161, 1281C. Cf. No. 80 of our list.

With regard to the doctrinal, rather than canonical, part of the teaching on marriage, the lack of personal contributions to the patristic dossier is equally true of later recensions of the original work. Hugh of St. Victor,[74] as we have mentioned before, placed a heavier stress on the questions of consanguinity and affinity for which he drew most of his material from Ivo's *Panormia*,[75] because the *SMA* treats this aspect very summarily. However, in writing the theological parts of his treatise on marriage, Hugh relied first of all on a later recension of the *SA*. We have noted a certain disagreement in this regard among the best historians of the school of Laon. According to H. Weisweiler[76] Hugh made use of the *SA*. This he does not consider to be the original work, but a recension of the marriage treatise published by Bliemetzrieder[77] in 1931.

We are not minded to debate the question of how original the marriage treatise of the *SA* is. We maintain only that among the known treatises it must be the most original one. F. Bliemetzrieder, who did not suspect the close dependence of the *SA* on the *SMA*, expressed the opinion that the *SA* is a compilation based on earlier sources.[78] There is no reason to deny that the writer of the *SA* availed himself of ideas and statements attributable to Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux, but our analysis of the patristic sources undoubtedly establishes the author's almost exclusive dependence on one single collection, viz., the *SMA*. Although this does not exclude the possibility that the *SA* may be an expansion of an earlier, much shorter treatise, it does at least enable us to show the posteriority of other treatises related to or dependent on it.[79] It is a reasonable premise that, among various interrelated treatises dealing with the same subject matter, priority is to be given to the treatise in which the totality of quotations approaches the known source more closely and consistently than do any of the others. On the strength of this principle it is beyond doubt that, for instance, the *DDf* is based on and posterior to the *SA*.

V.

The version of the marriage treatise published by Bliemetzrieder in 1931 is, according to its editor, an excerpt from the *SA*; H. Weisweiler holds that the relationship is reversed.[80] Weisweiler's view would mean that the author of the *SA* took over this treatise and not only enlarged it with a considerable number of patristic and post-patristic texts but also replaced the quotations, already contained in it, with more accurate and longer readings of the same quotations, for we shall see that the patristic texts of this treatise are fewer, shorter and less accurate than those of the *SA*. Such a process is not absolutely impossible, but is so highly improbable that much more solid arguments than text comparisons are necessary to demonstrate it, because the personal statements of an author can be shortened and expanded at will by him who makes a recension. The same uncertainty surrounds the argument of doctrinal progress, because a scholar who, for some reason, decides to make a revision does not necessarily raise the scientific standard of the previous work.

---

[74] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 14 f.; PL 176, 510C-520A.

[75] Cf. H. Weisweiler, "Die Arbeitsmethode", p. 251.

[76] "Das Schrifttum", 29 ff. "Die Arbeitsmethode", 246 ff.

[77] "Théologie et théologiens de l'école episcopale de Paris avant Pierre Lombard", *RTAM*, III (1931), 271-291.

[78] *SA*, 163. Cf. G. Lefèvre, *Les Variations de Guillaume de Champeaux* (Lille, 1898), pp. 68-74.

[79] It may be noted here that Bliemetzrieder published part of a marriage tract from the *Liber Pancrisis*, *Arch. f. k. Kirchenrecht*, CXV (1935), 73-79. I do not share his conviction that Ivo of Chartres is its author.

[80] H. Weisweiler, "Die Arbeitsmethode", 246: Die von Fr. Bliemetzrieder im Anschluss an die *Sententiae Anselmi* gedruckte Kompilation "Cum omnia sacramenta" ist eine Bearbeitung dieses Traktats unter Beifügung anderer Stücke. Cf. "Das Schrifttum", 29 ff.

We shall also see that Hugh of St. Victor did not use the *SA* (though both Bliemetzrieder and Weisweiler claim that he did) but this later recension or one very similar to it.[81] In order to explain the presence of certain patristic quotations in Hugh of St. Victor's work, H. Weisweiler believes that he must have used the *SA*.[82] But Hugh quotes some texts that are found only in the *SMA* and not in the *SA*. As a consequence we would have to include the *SMA* in his sources. Furthermore some titles of (Augustinian) works as cited by Hugh coincide with the *SMA*, not with the *SA*. We know for certain that Hugh of St. Victor possessed the *SMA* and used it in dealing with the Trinity. We are not at all certain that he possessed the *SA*, because the quotations he could have derived from it are well accounted for by the *SMA*. Hence it is not necessary to assume that Hugh used two treatises of the same kind. It may be objected that it was characteristic of Hugh to copy and expand works of earlier writers, but this proven fact should not be extended beyond provable examples. Much of his marriage treatise is indeed the fruit of his personal thought. After due consideration of Hugh's large borrowings from earlier writers, acknowledged as such by him or not, it cannot be denied that his personal contributions in his *De Sacramentis* in general are far more voluminous than, say, those of Peter Lombard. And just as Hugh consulted Ivo's *Panormia* in dealing with the laws governing consanguinity and affinity in marriage, so he perused the *SMA* to gather patristic texts to substantiate his teaching on other aspects of matrimony.

Before presenting and identifying the excerpts cited by the author of the marriage treatise published by Bliemetzrieder[83] in 1931, we take leave to note that in a number of cases the variants listed by the editor provide a better text than the edition portrays. The manuscript which the editor considered the worst copy is frequently closer to the source used by the author than the reading of the manuscripts the editor judged best. It may also be added that H. Weisweiler discovered and edited the introductory section of the same treatise. In the following list of quotations the numbering of the previous list is continued to facilitate cross references which might otherwise become too involved.

(90) Augustinus confirmat dicens: Poterant in paradiso esse honorabiles nuptiae et thorus immaculatus.[84]

The sentence occurs in a chapter of the *SA* listed under No. 8 and transcribed from the *SMA* in its context under No. 1.

(91) Alibi (Augustinus) ostendit: Utriusque sexus infirmitas propendens in ruinam turpitudinis recte honestate nuptiarum excipitur ut, quod sanis esset officium, sit aegrotis remedium.[85]

The text is listed under No. 7 and transcribed in its full context under No. 4. Although the Vatican manuscript reads: *et*, quod sanis *posset* esse officium, *fit* aegrotis remedium, the authentic reading in the *SMA* must have been the same as in the treatise *DDf*: ut, quod sanis *posset* esse officium, sit aegrotis remedium. The edition of the *SA* does not supply the full text to confirm it. The author of our treatise dropped *posset* and changed *esse* to *esset*. In this form it is quoted by Hugh of St. Victor.[86]

(92) . . . ut concupiscentia carnalis saltim fiat pudicitia conjugalis.[87]

---

[81] H. Weisweiler, "Die Arbeitsmethode", 246, notes that Hugh took his introduction from this treatise. Cf. "Das Schrifttum", 36 f.

[82] "Die Arbeitsmethode", 249.

[83] *RTAM*, III (1931), 271-291.

[84] H. Weisweiler, "Das Schrifttum", 34.

[85] *Ibid.* Cf. *Sent. Berolinenses*; ed. F. Stegmüller, 56: Denique utriusque sexus infirmitas procedens in ruinam turpitudinis facile excusatur honestate nuptiarum. Item dicit quod sanis esset officium, aegrotis factum est ad remedium.

[86] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 3; PL 176, 481D.

[87] Weisweiler, "Das Schrifttum", 34.

This remark is not attributed to a patristic authority, yet it is the final sentence of a short extract listed under No. 12. Its full text is quoted later: Augustinus: Bonum *conjugii* malum inoboedientium membrorum immutat quodammodo et modificat, ut carnalis concupiscentia fiat saltem pudicitia conjugalis.[88] The editor notes the variant *limitat* in place of *immutat*. The copy used by Hugh of St. Victor read *limitat* but had no other variant.[89] Instead of *conjugii* both the *SMA* and *SA* read *nuptiarum* (No. 12).

The author remarks shortly afterwards: Quippe propter hoc malum non sit culpabile illud bonum, immo propter hoc bonum veniale sit illud malum.[90] Its source will be found in Nos. 4 and 18 of our list.

(93) Bona conjugii principaliter tria sunt: fides, *spes prolis*, sacramentum. In fide attenditur, ne *propter* vinculum conjugale cum altera vel altero concumbatur; in spe prolis, ut *devote expectetur*, amanter suscipiatur, religiose enutriatur; in sacramento attenditur, ne conjugium separetur et dimissus aut dimissa nec causa prolis alteri *copuletur*.[91]

This anonymous text, as is well known, dates back to St. Augustine and is based on the chapter listed under No. 27, transcribed in its context under No. 4. The edition lists the variant *praeter* instead of *propter*. The *SMA*, as represented by the Vatican manuscript, reads *propter*, but Hugh's copy of our treatise read *praeter*. The most significant text variants, indicated by italics, prove that Hugh did not take the passage directly from the *SMA* or the *SA*. He did not attribute it to St. Augustine because his immediate source failed to do so. But he did make a slight addition: Tria sunt principaliter bona conjugii, *quae conjugium comitantur*; fides, *spes prolis*, sacramentum. In fide attenditur, ne *praeter* . . . in spe prolis attenditur, ut . . . *copuletur*.[92] The verb (in spe prolis) *attenditur* may have been added by Hugh himself or a scribe for the sake of greater uniformity.

(94) Dicit Augustinus quaedam bona conjugii omnibus esse communia, sacramenti vero sanctitatem, quae et res sacramenti dicitur, populo Dei i.e. solis fidelibus.[93]

The author states later: Sanctitas autem et res sacramenti est tantum *in civitate Dei nostri* et *in Monte sancto ejus*.[94] The first text goes back to No. 30 of our list. The author's later reference to *Ps.* xlvii, 2, is not entirely accidental, because St. Augustine was known to have cited it in such contexts.[95]

It seems that Hugh of St. Victor was aware of this when he claimed: Dicit beatus Augustinus quod sacramentum conjugii omnibus gentibus commune esse potest, sanctitas autem sacramenti nonnisi *in civitate Dei nostri* est et *in Monte sancto ejus*.[96]

(95) Et Ambrosius dicit: Conjugium non facit defloratio virginitatis sed pactio conjugalis.[97] The text agrees verbatim with the *SA* as listed under No. 53. Only the word position varies in the *SMA* and *DDf*. Both of these agree with that in Hugh of St. Victor.[98]

(96) Sed opponitur quod dicit Augustinus illos Christi et ecclesiae non habere sacramentum inter quos perhibetur carnale non fuisse commercium.[99]

---

[88] Fr. Bliemetzrieder, 275.

[89] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 7; PL 176, 494B: Bonum quippe conjugii . . . conjugalis. The word *quippe* was added by Hugh for emphasis.

[90] Bliemetzrieder, 275. Hugh's text in PL 176, 494C reads *fit* instead of *sit* in both cases. See No. 125 of this list.

[91] Bliemetzrieder, 275.

[92] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 7; PL 176, 494A.

[93] Bliemetzrieder, 276.

[94] *Ibid.*, 277. Cf. *Summa sent.* VII, 8; PL 176, 161A.

[95] Cf. *Pan.* VII, 6; PL 161, 1280C. See also *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 9, 10; PL 44, 420. *De Fide et op.*, 10; CSEL 41, 46.

[96] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 9; PL 176, 495D.

[97] Bliemetzrieder, 277.

[98] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 5; PL 176, 487B.

[99] Bliemetzrieder, 277. Cf. *Sent Berolinenses;* ed. F. Stegmüller, p. 61.

Even the grammatical construction is taken over from the *SA* (No. 55). The same holds for the next (No. 97) quotation, also listed under No. 55.

(97) Sed dicit rursus Augustinus: Illa mulier non potest pertinere ad matrimonium, cum qua perhibetur non fuisse commixtio sexuum.[1]

Hugh of St. Victor refers to this sentence as follows: Dictum est: Illa mulier non potest pertinere ad Christi et ecclesiae sacramentum, cum qua *noscitur* non fuisse *carnale commercium.*[2] Perhaps he realized that the two quotations (Nos. 96 f.) were actually one and for that reason transferred the expression *carnale commercium.*

(98) Sed rursus dicit auctoritas: Non est perfectum conjugium, ubi non sequitur commixtio sexuum.[3]

Again we have literal agreement with the *SA*, including the introductory sentence. It is found listed under No. 55. Note too that, like the *SA*, our treatise does not cite the excerpt from the Leonine decretal, the misunderstanding of which had led to the two spurious texts quoted under Nos. 96 f.

(99) Rursus ille qui dixit: Matrimonium non facit coitus sed voluntas, hoc significavit . . .[4]

Here the author of the treatise copied not only the patristic excerpt as found in the *SA*, but also its analysis. The quotation is listed under No. 55.

(100) Commune vero omnibus esse conjugium Augustinus testatur dicens: Si Dominus dimmittendae conjugis solam causam fornicationis admittit et paganum conjugium dimitti prohibet, consequens est ut paganismus *non* subjaceat fornicationi.[5]

The writer of our treatise did not find the text in the *SA* (as published). It is the beginning of a chapter in the *SMA* which in the Vatican manuscript reads as follows: Idem ex *libro Quaestionum* de dimittenda conjuge: Si Dominus dimittendae conjugis solam causam fornicationis et excipit et pagan[ism]um conjugium dimmitti prohibet, consequens est ut paganismus fornicationi deputetur.[6] Since this reading is obviously faulty, we may quote St. Augustine's own words: Si Dominus dimmittendae conjugis solam causam fornicationis admittit et paganum conjugium dimitti *non* prohibet, consequens est ut paganismus fornicatio deputetur.[7] Although even the authentic reading of the Augustinian text is not firmly established, it is obvious that the author of our treatise is responsible for the verb *subjaceat* instead of *deputetur*, but not for the transposition of *non* which is found in the *SMA* as well as in some manuscripts of the Augustinian work.[8] Of greater immediate interest is the fact that Hugh of St. Victor cites the passage in exactly the same manner as our marriage treatise.[9]

(101) Et alibi dicit: Cum Evangelium primum coepit praedicari, gentiles gentibus *esse* conjunctos invenit conjuges.[10]

Hugh of St. Victor quotes: Cum Evangelium coepit praedicari primum, gentiles gentilibus conjunctos invenit conjuges.[11] A number of manuscripts listed by Bliemetzrieder also omitted the verb *esse*. The author of the treatise found the sentence in a long excerpt listed under No. 50. This is also the direct source of the next quotation.

---

[1] Bliemetzrieder, 277. Cf. *Sent. Berolinenses;* ed. F. Stegmüller, p. 61.

[2] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 3; PL 176, 482A.

[3] Bliemetzrieder, 277.

[4] Bliemetzrieder, 278. Cf. *DDf*, 371 (note to line 21).

[5] Bliemetzrieder, 278.

[6] *SMA*, fol. 69^{vb}.

[7] *De Div. quaestionibus*, qu. 83; PL 40, 100.

[8] See the variants in PL 40, 100.

[9] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 13; PL 176, 506C.

[10] Bliemetzrieder, 278.

[11] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 13; PL 176, 506B.

(102) In libro *De Adulterinis conjugiis* dicit: Conjugis discessionem Dominus prohibet . . . ab infidelitate resolvuntur.[12]

The edition lists the variant *Dominus non prohibet*; this is supported by the *SMA* (on which this text is based), Ivo's *Panormia*[13] and the original work of St. Augustine himself.[14] It is confirmed by Hugh of St. Victor: Dicit beatus Augustinus in libro *De Adulterinis conjugiis*: Discessionem fidelis ab infideli Dominus non prohibet . . . resolvantur.[15]

(103) Ambrosius dicit: Non est ratum conjugium praeter Deum et ideo non est peccatum dimissio propter Deum, si alii copuletur. Si autem alii conjungatur, peccatum non est. Injuria enim Creatoris solvit jus matrimonii.[16]

Something went wrong in the transmission of this text. The *SA*, from which the statement is derived (No. 47), presents two separate statements of which the first is attributed to St. Ambrose, the second to St. Augustine. Among the variants listed by the editor the name of St. Augustine actually appears in three (out of six) manuscripts which read: . . . alii copuletur. Et Augustinus dicit: Dimissio propter Deum non est peccatum, si alii conjungatur. Injuria enim Creatoris solvit jus matrimonii. This reading is far more preferable to the editor's choice because it is almost identical with its immediate source, listed under No. 47, and with the reading in Hugh of St. Victor: Beatus Ambrosius dicit: Non est ratum conjugium praeter Deum et ideo non est peccatum dimissio propter Deum, si aliis (*read* alii) copuletur. Item, beatus Gregorius dicit: Dimissio propter Deum non est peccatum, si alii conjungatur. Injuria enim Creatoris solvit jus matrimonii.[17] A critical edition of Hugh's work may explain how the name of Gregory slipped into the text.

(104) Quod totum testatur Gregorius in *Registro*.[18]

The allusion is based on No. 57 of our list.

(105) Sed dicit Augustinus: Manet inter viventes quoddam conjugale *vinculum* quod neque *adulterio* neque cum alia *copula* potest *auferri*, sicut anima apostata et fide perdita sacramentum, quod accepit in lavacro regenerationis, non potest amittere.[19]

Three manuscripts, as noted by the editor, omit the word *vinculum*. It is also omitted in the *SA* (No. 61) and the *SMA*. The same manuscripts read *adulteratio*, *copulatio* and *auferre* instead of *adulterio*, *copula* and *auferri*. Thus they agree to the letter with the *SA* and the SMA. The comparison with Baptism is based on the long excerpt listed under No. 31.

(106) Hieronymus tamen videtur negare quod reconciliari possit ubi dicit: Rem novam . . . voluerit, non potest.[20]

The entire passage, including the introductory sentence, is taken from the *SA* as listed under No. 87.

(107) Innocentius autem papa, cujus auctoritas supra Augustinum, Gregorium, Hieronymum videtur adseminare . . . his verbis: Quae Christo spiritualiter nubunt . . . sponso se junxerat.[21]

The rather unusual introduction is slightly less ponderous in the *SA*: Innocentius autem papa . . . cujus auctoritas magna est, videtur *asserere* . . . sponso junxerat (No. 89). Only three of the editor's manuscripts read the strange *adseminare* while one reads *assentire* and two the original *asserere*. Hugh of St. Victor is more restrained: Innocentius enim papa, cujus auctoritas in ecclesia

---

[12] Bliemetzrieder, 278 f.

[13] *Pan.* VI, 101; PL 161, 1268B.

[14] *De Adulterinis conj.*, 18, 22; CSEL 41, 369.

[15] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 13; PL 176, 509A.

[16] Bliemetzrieder, 279.

[17] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 13; PL 176, 506C.

[18] Bliemetzrieder, 280. Cf. *DDf*, 372 (note to line 13).

[19] Bliemetzrieder, 280 f.

[20] Bliemetzrieder, 283.

[21] *Ibid.*

Christi celebris est, sic dicit: Quae Christo . . . se immortali Sponso junxerat.[22]

(108) . . . non contradicit Leo papa quod si aliqua, vivente viro suo, cum alio adulterata fuerit, mortuo marito, illi nubere non possit.[23]

The statement is based on the text listed under No. 80.

(109) Eucharistius papa dicit non esse legitimum conjugium, nisi . . . benedicatur a sacerdotibus.[24]

The chapter of the *SA*, from which this text is taken, is listed under No. 56.

(110) Si aliquis proprium filium suum de sacro fonte levaverit, Deusdedit papa dicit eum ab uxore sua separandum. Johannes papa dicit quod, si necessitate ad hoc inducatur, non est separandus.[25]

These two statements do not occur in the *SA*. They are derived from Ivo of Chartres[26] and cited in the *Summa sententiarum.*[27]

(111) Qui vero causa voluptatis explendae conveniunt, conjuges non sunt secundum Augustinum qui ait in libro *De Concupiscentiis nuptiarum*: Si ambo tales sunt, conjuges non sunt et si *in ambitione* tales fuerint, per connubium non conveniunt sed per stuprum.[28]

In view of the fact that two manuscripts read *De Nuptiis et concupiscentia*, this accurate title should have been given preference, just as the right reading *ab initio* supported by two manuscripts should have been chosen instead of the nonsensical *in ambitione*. St. Augustine wrote: Si ambo tales sunt, conjuges non sunt. Et si ab initio tales fuerunt, non sibi per connubium sed per stuprum potius convenerunt.[29]

This text is not found in the *SA*. It is also absent from the *SMA* as preserved in the Vatican manuscript. With the exception of two papal decretals (No. 110) and the text listed under No. 100, the *SA* provided the author with all other patristic source material. Only in two instances does he name the title of an Augustinian work (Nos. 102 and 111). Equally significant is the omission of many quotations which the author of the *SA* had considered useful aids in corroborating his doctrine. We noted the same process of elimination in the *DDf* whose author names the title of but one Augustinian book.[30]

This development reflects what seems to be a different teaching method. While the method of quoting numerous and lengthy patristic excerpts could easily become monotonous, unless real or apparent contradictions called for an interpretation, a straight exposition of doctrine added a more personal touch to an otherwise perhaps tedious repetition of texts which were readily available elsewhere and only confirmed what was actually accepted by all without controversy.

We may here recall Abelard's reaction against the *sententiarum collationes* practised at Laon. He claimed they were so self-explanatory that they required no teacher.[31] In 1148, Gilbert of Poitiers pointed out that, in commenting upon the Boethian *Opuscula Sacra*, he did not want to be a *recitator* but rather a *lector* acting as interpreter. In no way did he, as interpreter, want to be classed with *auctores qui sententiam propriam ferunt.*[32] Expressing a commentator's attitude, this restriction was no critique, but rather a recognition of authors who pass on their personal judgment in their own words rather than repeat or recite the very same statements of earlier writers.[33] Toward the end of the century the

---

[22] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 12; PL 176, 503C.

[23] Bliemetzrieder, 284.

[24] *Ibid.*

[25] *Ibid.*, 285.

[26] *Decr.* I, 305 f.; *Pan.* VI, 27; PL 161, 132B; 1277C.

[27] *Summa sent.* VII, 20; PL 176, 171BD.

[28] Bliemetzrieder, 286.

[29] *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 15, 17; PL 44, 424.

[30] *DDf*, 378. Cf. *DDf*, 368: Hieronymus in explanatione Osee.

[31] *Hist. calam.*; ed. J. T. Muckle, *Med. Studies*, XII (1950), 180 f.

[32] PL 64, 1247.

[33] PL 64, 1247: Recitatores qui eadem auctorum verba et ex ipsorum causis eisdem pronuntiant.

Cistercian Everard of Ypres accused the monks of a sterile method of transcribing patristic texts instead of explaining them.[34]

Our comparative study is an apt (if incomplete) illustration of the change from the *recitator* to the *auctor*: the former presents us with many literal quotations, the latter expounds a doctrine in his own words and shortens the *dicta patrum.* It would indeed be interesting to show how later recensions of the original marriage treatise of Laon synthesize in a single sentence the basic point of a patristic excerpt, how the terminology coined by St. Augustine lives on, while the explicit mention of his name grows rarer and rarer. Thus, a recension edited by H. Weisweiler[35] in 1933 mentions Augustine's name only twice (among six other names) and no effort is made to retain the actual original words of the source. To cite an example, Augustine is supposed to have written: *Non dicimus esse conjugium, ubi carnalis copula non habuit officium.*[36] And with the same almost poetical regard for the student's memory we read immediately after: *Leo papa: Non est legitimum matrimonium, ubi constat deesse carnale commercium.*[37] In another generation such a short and pithy formula becomes known as *auctoritas*, an expression already used in the *SA*. The mention of Pope Leo's name in the text just quoted and the fact that the names of Pope Nicholas and St. John Chrysostom appear in the treatise together with that of St. Ambrose during the discussion on the essential element of marriage,[38] proves that canonical sources continued to exert a certain influence. We have previously noted that, in the gradual disappearance of names, even the famous Augustinian passage on the three *bona conjugii* became anonymous (Cf. No. 93). And just like Hugh of St. Victor, the author of our recension was probably unaware of its Augustinian origin when he wrote: *Bonum tamen conjugii* dicitur *esse triplex* . . .[39] If we can trust the Migne edition, Peter Lombard did not hesitate to attribute it to St. Ambrose,[40] though it is assigned to Augustine in the same commentary.[41] In both cases the original text is abbreviated.[42]

VI.

Before we return to Hugh of St. Victor, it is well to recall that, in his excellent articles on the canonical collections attributed to Ivo of Chartres, Paul Fournier has demonstrated Hugh's dependence on Ivo's *Decretum* and *Panormia.*[43] As a general statement this dependence can hardly be denied, though disagreement or greater reserve may well be justified in the case of individual texts. H. Weisweiler[44] has proven that, with the exception of two excerpts (not found in Ivo), all texts cited by Hugh in his chapters on consanguinity and affinity are derived from Ivo's *Panormia.* With regard to the previous chapters of Hugh's marriage treatise, Fournier's list (p. 658), which is admittedly incomplete, should be modified in the sense that Ivo's collections were only the remote source for some of Hugh's quotations. Other texts, as we have already seen, were directly copied by Hugh from a recension of the *SA*. In addition he used the *SMA*, not the original *SA*. To make references easier, we shall continue with the numeration.

---

[34] *Dialogus Ratii et Everardi;* ed. N. M. Haring, *Med. Studies*, XV (1953), 277.

[35] "Le recueil des sentences 'Deus de cujus principio et fine tacetur' et son remaniement", *RTAM*, V (1933), 270-274.

[36] *Ibid.*, 272. See No. 55 of our list.

[37] *Ibid.*

[38] *Ibid.*, 271. Cf. *Summa sent.* VII, 6; PL 176, 158CD.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

[40] *In I Cor.* vii, 2; PL 191, 1586D.

[41] PL 191, 1589B. I assume that the footnote (Augustinus *super Genesim*) was a marginal note.

[42] The text in *Sent.* IV, 31, 1; p. 935, seems to be copied directly from *De Gen. ad litt.* IX, 7, 12; PL 34, 397.

[43] *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes*, LVIII (1897), 658 ff.

[44] "Die Arbeitsmethode", p. 251.

(112) . . . beatus Augustinus testatur his verbis dicens: Utriusque sexus . . . aegrotis remedium.[45]

We have met Hugh's reading of this text under No. 91.

(113) Idem: In conjugio aliud esse et alterius rei sacramentum esse ipsum conjugium et aliud esse et alterius rei sacramentum esse ipsum conjugii officium.

Hugh summarizes here the distinction between *conjugium* and *officium* with their respective *res* and *sacramentum*. These he elucidates later in the same chapter.[46] In the treatise he used he found the sentence: Sic enim aliud est sacramentum conjugii et aliud res ipsius sacramenti sicut aliud est sacramentum baptismi et aliud res ipsius sacramenti.[47] Hugh's insistence on the *officium*[48] serves an important purpose in the discussion following the first four patristic quotations. The term itself occurs in the previous text (No. 112).

(114) Idem ipse in libro *De Bono conjugali*: In conjugio aliquid boni . . . in quibus etsi emarcuerit ardor carnis, viget tamen ordo caritatis.[49]

Instead of *ardor carnis*, St. Augustine, the *SMA* and the *SA* read *ardor aetatis*. If Hugh of St. Victor had copied the text from the *SA*, he would not have omitted the interpolation we have noted in the evaluation of this excerpt in No. 16. This is definite proof that Hugh did not use, at least, the *SA* as published, but either a different, not interpolated, version or, what is much more likely, the *SMA*.

(115) Item: In nuptiis plus valet sanctitas sacramenti quam fecunditas uteri.[50]

Hugh could not copy this text from the *SA* or any of its known recensions, because they do not contain it. The change to *uteri* from Augustine's *ventris* was not made by Hugh himself but by the author of the *SMA* or his source.[51] Lombard faithfully copied Hugh's reading.[52]

(116) Dictum est: Illa mulier non potest . . . carnale commercium.[53]

We have dealt with this text under No. 96.

(117) Quidam hoc modo conjugium definiendum putaverunt ut dicerent conjugium esse consensum masculi et feminae individualem vitae consuetudinem retinentem.[54]

The wording *consensum masculi et feminae* reveals that Hugh did not derive the definition directly from Ivo's collections, as Fournier suggests, because they define marriage as *viri mulierisque conjunctio individuam consuetudinem vitae continens*. The modified definition referred to by Hugh was current in the school of Laon (No. 51). Hugh found it in the recension which claims: Conjugium est secundum Isidorum consensus masculi et feminae individualem vitae consuetudinem retinens.[55]

(118) . . . beatus Ambrosius testatur dicens: Non defloratio virginitatis sed pactio conjugalis conjugium facit.[56]

If we assume that Hugh cites this text exactly as his source, he copied it from the *SMA*. Ivo's collections and the *SA* read: Non (enim) defloratio virginitatis facit conjugium sed pactio conjugalis.[57] The word order in the recension at Hugh's disposal varied slightly: Conjugium non facit defloratio virginitatis sed pactio conjugalis (No. 95).

---

[45] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 3; PL 176, 481D. Cf. *Summa sent.* VII, 2; PL 176, 156A. *Sent.* IV, 26, 2; p. 912.

[46] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 3; PL 176, 482A-483A.

[47] Ed. Bliemetzrieder, *RTAM*, III (1931), 275.

[48] Cf. Hugh of St. Victor, *De b. Mariae virginitate;* PL 176, 863B; 865A; 874C.

[49] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 3; PL 176, 481D. *De Bono conj.*, 3, 3; CSEL 41, 190.

[50] *De Sacr., ibid.; De Bono conj.*, 18, 21; CSEL 41, 215.

[51] *SMA*, fol. 55^{va}.

[52] *Sent.* IV, 26, 6; p. 916.

[53] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 3; PL 176, 482A.

[54] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 4; PL 176, 483A.

[55] Ed. Bliemetzrieder, *RTAM*, III (1931), 274.

[56] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 5; PL 176, 987B.

[57] *Decr.* VIII, 2; *Pan.* VI, 14; PL 161, 583D; 1247A.

(119) Item: Conjugium non facit coitus sed consensus, qui si defuerit, omnia etiam cum ipso coitu frustrantur.[58]

Since the text occurs neither in the *SA* nor in the recension used by Hugh, he must have found it where he copied the previous text. In fact, in the *SMA* the excerpt attributed to Ambrose (No. 118) is immediately followed by an anonymous text which reads: Solus secundum leges eorum sufficiat consensus, de quorum quarumque conjunctionibus agitur, qua (*read* qui) si defuerit, omnia etiam cum ipso coitu frustrantur. Consensus enim facit conjugium, non coitus.[59] If Hugh had used Ivo's collections, he would have attributed it to Pope Nicholas[60] rather than to *Item*, implying St. Ambrose. In addition, he would have written: Matrimonium non facit coitus sed voluntas.

(120) Isidorus enim dicit quod conjuges verius appellantur a prima desponsationis fide, quamvis adhuc inter eos ignoretur conjugalis concubitus.[61]

The reading agrees verbatim with that of the *SMA*[62] where it follows immediately upon the texts listed under Nos. 118 and 119. In Ivo's collections the wording is the same,[63] but there is no trace of it in the *SA* or in the recension used by Hugh. While the *SMA* and Hugh omit the title of Isidore's work, Ivo provides it: Isidorus in *Etym.* IX, 7. Its omission in the *SMA* explains Hugh's omission.

(121) Unde de Matre Domini Augustinus dicit quod a prima desponsationis fide conjux vocata est Joseph, quam concubitu non noverat nec fuerat cogniturus.[64]

The text is not found in the *SA* or in the recension used by our author. The *SMA* reads: Augustinus: Conjux vocatur a prima desponsationis fide, quam concubitu nec cognoverat nec fuerat cogniturus.[65] This faulty quotation goes back to Ivo.[66] It seems that Hugh himself rearranged the words to avoid the misleading *fide, quam . . .*

(122) Et Ambrosius similiter: Desponsata viro conjugis nomen accepit.[67]

The sentence is found in the *SMA*[68] and in Ivo's collections.[69]

(123) Tria sunt principaliter bona conjugii . . . copuletur.[70]

With this quotation we return to the recension used by Hugh; it has been discussed under No. 93.

(124) Bonum quippe conjugii, ut dicit beatus Augustinus, malum . . . pudicitia conjugalis.[71]

Hugh's immediate source has been shown under No. 92.

(125) Quippe propter hoc malum non fit culpabile . . . veniale fit illud malum.[72]

The anonymity of this Augustinian sentence is also explained in No. 92 of this list.

(126) Augustinus *ad Valerium*: Non tantum fecunditas . . . quamdiu vivunt, non separentur.[73] Although H. Weisweiler[74] suggests that Hugh copied this text from

---

[58] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 5; PL 176, 487B. Cf. No. 52 of our list.

[59] *SMA*, fol. 48^{rb}.

[60] *Pan.* VI, 107; *Decr.* VIII, 17; PL 161, 1272B; 588A. Cf. *Decr.* VIII, 233 (634A).

[61] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 5; PL 176, 487B.

[62] *SMA*, fol. 48^{rb}.

[63] *Decr.* VIII, 3; *Pan.* VI, 15; PL 161, 583D; 1247A. Cf. *Summa sent.* VII, 6; PL 176, 158D.

[64] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 5; PL 176, 487D. *De Nupt. et con.* I, 11, 12; PL 44, 421.

[65] *SMA*, fol. 48^{va}.

[66] *Pan.* VI, 16; PL 161, 1247B: . . . quam concubitu non noverat Joseph nec fuerat cogniturus. *Decr.* VIII, 14; PL 161, 586D: Conjux vocatur ex prima . . . quam concubitu nec cognoverat nec fuerat cogniturus.

[67] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 5; PL 176, 487D.

[68] *SMA*, fol. 48^{ra}.

[69] *Pan.* VI, 14; *Decr.* VIII, 2; PL 161, 1247A; 583D.

[70] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 7; PL 176, 494A.

[71] *De Sacr.*, *ibid.*

[72] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 7; PL 176, 494C. The text preceding this sentence (Duobus autem modis . . . a vago concubitu modificat) is an expansion of a sentence in the recension used by Hugh which reads: Duobus autem modis . . . a vago concubitu restringit. Ed. F. Bliemetzrieder, *RTAM*, III (1931), 275.

[73] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 7; PL 176, 494D. *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 10, 11; PL 44, 420.

the *SA* (No. 29), the *SMA* sufficiently accounts for its presence in Hugh's *De Sacramentis.*

(127) Unde Augustinus: Usque adeo foedus nuptiarum . . . ita ut conjuges sint etiam separati.[75]

In quoting this passage a second time (No. 135), Hugh explicitly ascribes it to Augustine's *De Bono conjugali.*[76] P. Fournier[77] claims that the author derived it from Ivo's *Decretum*[78] which, however, offers a different and shorter version of the excerpt. Hugh's text is not found in the *SA* but in the *SMA*[79] which agrees literally with the reading in *De Sacramentis. Magister A* did not transcribe it from Ivo.

(128) Dicit enim beatus Augustinus quod sacramentum conjugii . . . in Monte sancto ejus.[80]

Hugh repeats this statement almost verbatim in a later chapter.[81] We have examined this quotation under No. 94.

(129) Beatus Augustinus . . . sic dicit: Concubitum qui non fit causa prolis . . . per fidelem mulierem etc.[82]

This chapter is listed under No. 19 and reappears in the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard who, however, used a different source.[83]

(130) Augustinus sic dicit: Antiquis temporibus cum adhuc . . . Habebant enim eas in opere generandi, non in morbo desiderii.[84]

We have explained (No. 36) why the last sentence is missing in the *SA*. Unless it can be shown that the *SA* did contain the sentence, it is evident that Hugh did not take the excerpt from the *SA*. Lombard transcribed the text from *De Sacramentis.*[85]

(131) Idem in libro *De Virginibus*: Antiquis justis . . . nulla lege erat prohibitum.[86]

Since the *SA*, as listed under No. 33, ascribes this passage to the *De Virginitate* and the *SMA* calls it *De Virginibus*, we have here another piece of evidence that Hugh made use of the *SMA*. Although Lombard wisely omitted the wrong title, there is no doubt that he copied the excerpt from Hugh of St. Victor.[87]

(132) Verumtamen, sicut idem alibi[88] testatur, magis . . . primi conjugis copula divinitus facta, ut inde connubia sumerent initium, ubi honestius attenderetur exemplum.[89]

If we correct *conjugis* to *conjugii*, we have a faithful transcription of a text the *incipit* of which is listed under No. 38 where it is clearly attributed to Augustinus *ad Valerium*. Why then did Hugh use the vague *idem alibi testatur*? Hugh's text occurs in a long compilation (No. 11) containing, among other excerpts, the chapter listed under No. 38 with the title of St. Augustine's work. In copying his text from the *SMA*, Hugh was confronted with a long compilation of texts divided (at least in the Vatican manuscript) into a number of paragraphs. The copyist might have felt an uncertainty concerning the continuity of the same source. Thus Hugh may have considered it safer not to commit himself on the title.

---

[74] "Die Arbeitsmethode", p. 249.

[75] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 8; PL 176, 495B. *De Bono conj.*, 7, 6; CSEL 41, 196 f.

[76] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 11; PL 176, 497D.

[77] "Les coll. canoniques", 658.

[78] *Decr.* VIII, 235; PL 161, 634D.

[79] *SMA*, fol. 53^{vb}.

[80] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 9; PL 176, 495D.

[81] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 13; PL 176, 506B.

[82] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 9; PL 176, 496CD.

[83] *Sent.* IV, 31, 7; p. 941.

[84] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 10; PL 176, 496D. *De Bono conj.*, 13, 15; CSEL 41, 207. The fact that this excerpt occurs in the *SA* escaped H. Weisweiler's attention. Cf. "Die Arbeitsmethode", p. 249.

[85] *Sent.* IV, 33, 1; p. 949.

[86] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 10; PL 176, 497A. *De Bono conj.*, 25, 33; CSEL 41, 228.

[87] *Sent.* IV, 33, 1; p. 949.

[88] *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 9, 10; PL 44, 419.

[89] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 10; PL 176, 497A.

(133) Item idem: Sicut non est impar . . . tunc non oportuit.[90]
This popular text,[91] listed under No. 34, is found in the *SMA* and the *SA*.

(134) Idem: Justus quamvis . . . venialis ille concubitus.[92]
Contained in both the *SMA* and the *SA*, this text is listed under No. 35 and was copied from Hugh by Peter Lombard.[93] The fact that the Nos. 129-134 are in reality a little *florilegium* also suggests that Hugh transcribed it from the *SMA*.

(135) Dicit enim beatus Augustinus in libro *De Bono conjugali*: Usque adeo foedus . . . alteri nupserit. Et idem: Quia . . . etiam separati.[94]
We have noted (No. 127) that these sentences do not occur in the *SA* but in the *SMA*.

(136) Legimus quod beatus Gregorius Anglis . . . concessit a quinto gradu consanguinitatis conjugia copulari.[95]
Hugh could derive this information from the *SMA*[96] and Ivo's *Panormia*.[97]

(137) Beatus Augustinus in libro *De Professione sanctae viduitatis* sic ait: In conjugali vinculo si pudicitia conservatur . . . irritam facerent. Et post pauca: Proinde . . . viro nubit. Et post pauca: Fit autem . . . adulteriis esse pejores.[98]
The manner of connecting the three long excerpts, and their unusually faithful agreement with the original,[99] indicate a different source. The strange, but not entirely unique, title[1] insinuates that Hugh did not consult the original work. At the same time a comparison with a similar compilation in Abelard's *Sic et Non* reassures us that Hugh did not transcribe it from Abelard who calls the work *De Continentia viduali*.[2]

(138) Innocentius enim papa . . . quae se immortali Sponso junxerat.[3]
We have noted this text under Nos. 89 and 107.

(139) Dicit beatus Augustinus quod sacramentum conjugii . . . in Monte sancto ejus.[4]
Hugh made the same claim on an earlier occasion, as explained under No. 128.

(140) Item: Cum Evangelium coepit praedicari primum, gentiles gentilibus conjunctos invenit conjuges.[5]
Its immediate source is found under No. 101. The text is also cited in the marriage treatise of the *Summa sententiarum* whose author adapted it from Ivo's *Panormia*.[6]

(141) Item: Si Dominus dimittendae . . . subjaceat fornicationi.[7]
We have seen under No. 100 that Hugh's direct source was a recension of the *SA*.

(142) Ambrosius dicit: Non est ratum conjugium . . . jus matrimonii.[8]

---

[90] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 10; PL 176, 497B. *De Bono conj.*, 21, 26—22, 27; CSEL, 41 221 f.

[91] Cf. H. Weisweiler, "Das Schrifttum", p. 206. Héloise, *Ep. VI;* PL 178, 222C. Abelard, *Sic et Non*, 130; PL 178, 1561D. *Sent.* IV, 33, 2; p. 950.

[92] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 10; PL 176, 497B.

[93] *Sent.* IV, 3, 1; p. 950.

[94] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 11; PL 176, 497D.

[95] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 11; PL 176, 499A.

[96] *SMA*, fol. 78^{rb}.

[97] *Pan.* VII, 58 and 73; PL 161, 1295C; 1299B.

[98] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 12; PL 176, 499C-500C. *De Bono viduitatis*, 9, 12—11, 14; CSEL 41, 317-320.

[99] Instead of *tamen* (499D) Augustine wrote *tantum;* in place of *ipsi Christo* (500B), he wrote *ipsum Christum*.

[1] Cf. Abelard, *Sic et Non*, 129; PL 178, 1559B: Augustinus *De Professione sanctae viduitatis* ad Julianum: De tertiis . . . auferre. See No. 42 of our list.

[2] *Sic et Non*, 122; PL 178, 1542C: Idem *De Continentia viduali*. . . .

[3] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 12; PL 176, 503C.

[4] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 13; PL 176, 506B.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *Summa sent.* VII, 8; PL 176, 160D. *Pan.* VI, 101; PL 161, 1267B. *De adult. conj.*, 18, 20; CSEL 41, 367. Cf. No. 50 of this list and *SMA* fol. 67va.

[7] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 13; PL 176, 506C.

[8] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 13; PL 176, 506C.

The text was copied from the same recension as listed under No. 103.

(143) Dicit beatus Augustinus in libro *De Adulterinis conjugiis*: Discessionem . . . ab infidelitate resolvantur.[9]

Apart from a slight adjustment of the first few words, Hugh borrowed the reading from the same recension analyzed under No. 102.

This brings to an end our list of quotations cited by Hugh of St. Victor, with the exception of the next two chapters (on consanguinity and affinity) for which Hugh found very little material in the *SMA* and even less in the marriage treatises of the school of Laon. By his personal use of the *SMA* he partly restored the patristic dossier of the original treatise. In fact we have seen that some of his texts (Nos. 115, 119-122, 137) are new arrivals and best explained by recourse to the *SMA*, except No. 137 which may be the fruit of Hugh's personal reading of St. Augustine's *De Bono viduitatis*. The *SMA* also accounts for the texts common to his *De Sacramentis* and the *SA*. Through Hugh as intermediary the *SMA* reached the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard.

Since Lombard wrote his commentary on the Pauline Epistles in the early forties of the century, one may be inclined to look for traces of the *SMA* at least in such parts as deal with similar subject matter. Some relationship between his presentation of the teaching on marriage and the current marriage treatises manifests itself in a rather vague manner of quoting which suggests that, to some extent, he relied on secondary sources. We have already drawn attention to the fact that he attributes a famous Augustinian text to St. Ambrose.[10] Concerning the constitutive elements of marriage he refers to . . . *illud Nicolai papae: Sufficiat solus . . . celebrata frustrantur. Unde etiam illud (Ambrosius): Matrimonium non facit coitus sed voluntas. Hinc etiam illud: Non defloratio . . . matrimonium facit.*[11] If Lombard had consulted a canonical collection, he would have ascribed to St. John Chrysostom what he explicitly attributes to St. Ambrose; he would have been more definite with regard to the author of the third text. In other words, he borrowed from some treatise where the fairly high standard of accuracy of the original work had declined. We come closer to the *SMA* when he claims: *Unde Augustinus: Conjugalis concubitus . . . propter thori fidem, venialem. Item: Quod conjugati victi . . . debita nostra etc.*[12] Both excerpts date back to the *SMA*[13] and the *SA* (Nos. 14 and 17). They appear together, but in reversed order, in the *Summa sententiarum*.[14] At a later date, Lombard copied them from his own commentary and inserted them in his *Sentences*.[15]

Lombard rightly attributes to Augustine the statement: *Debent ergo sibi conjugati . . . est criminis*.[16] A comparison of this text with the corresponding excerpt in the *SMA* or Ivo's collections shows that Lombard derived it from a different source.[17] We may assume that the same source provided him with the text: *Non enim quia incontinentia malum est . . . separetur*.[18] It was known in the school of Laon through the *SA* (Nos. 18 and 27), but again Lombard appears to have used a different source.[19]

It is safe to conclude that Peter Lombard made no direct and personal use of the *SMA* in his commentaries on St. Paul. His marriage treatise in the *Sentences* leans heavily on Gratian's *Decretum*, Hugh of St. Victor and the *Summa sententiarum*. Mainly through the first two channels Lombard incorporated in his *Sentences* a number of texts which had been collected by *magister A.*

---

[9] *De Sacr.* II, 11, 13; PL 176, 509A. Read *solvit* instead of *solum*.

[10] *In I Cor.* vii, 2; PL 191, 1586D. Cf. 191, 1589B.

[11] *In I Cor.* vii, 2; PL 191, 1586B.

[12] PL 191, 1587A.

[13] *SMA*, fols. 53^{vb} and 52^{va}.

[14] *Summa sent.* VII, 3: PL 176, 156AC.

[15] *Sent.* IV, 31, 5; p. 939.

[16] PL 191, 1588A. Cf. *Sent. Berol.;* ed. F. Stegmüller, p. 57.

[17] The *SMA* (fol. 52^{vb}) is shorter and attributes it to St. Ambrose, Ivo's *Panormia* VI, 26 (PL 161, 1248C) to Jerome, his *Decretum* VIII, 234 f. (PL 161, 634C) to Augustine. Cf. Gratian, *Decr.* C. 32, qu. 2, c. 3. In his *Sent.* IV, 32, 1; p. 949, Lombard attaches no name to it. Maître Simon, *Tract. de sacramentis;* ed. Weisweiler, p. 54, assigns it to Ambrosius in secundo libro *super Lucam*.

[18] PL 191, 1589B.

[19] The text: Concubitus enim necessarius . . . libidini obsequitur (PL 191, 1589B) does not occur in the *SMA* and is taken from *De Bono conj.*, 10, 11; CSEL 41, 203.

VII.

Walter of Mortagne, the author of the marriage treatise in the *Summa sententiarum*, also transmitted a certain amount of such excerpts, though it is difficult to establish whether he made direct use of the *SMA*. P. Fournier[20] has shown Walter's dependence on Ivo's collections; rather than repeat his demonstrations, we shall examine the texts derived from sources not discussed by Fournier.

(144) Augustinus *super Genesim ad litteram* de conjugio loquens his verbis: Quod sanis posset esse officium, aegrotis est ad remedium.[21]

It is the final sentence of a chapter cited in the *SA* (No. 7) with the title Augustinus *super Genesim*. Lombard copied it from Hugh of St. Victor.[22]

(145) Unde Augustinus *De Bono nuptiarum*: Hoc quo(d) conjugati . . . debitoribus nostris.[23]

We have seen that the *SA* (No. 17) contained this text in a longer chapter copied from the *SMA* and attributed in both works to Augustinus *De Sancta viduitate*. The *SA* (No. 14) and the *SMA* also contain the following excerpt:

(146) Augustinus . . . in libro *De Bono conjugali*: Conjugalis concubitus . . . venialem habet culpam.[24]

It will be recalled that Lombard cites both texts (Nos. 145 f.) under Augustine's name, but without title, on two different occasions.[25]

(147) Augustinus: Bonum nuptiarum tripartitum est . . . alteri conjungatur.[26]

This famous text was popularized through the *SMA* and the *SA* (No. 27)

(148) Idem in libro *De Bono conjugali*: Bonum nuptiarum . . . Dei pertinet, in fide sacramenti.[27]

Instead of *in fide sacramenti* the *SMA* reads *etiam in sanctitate est sacramenti.*[28] The text was passed on through the *SA* (No. 31) but was soon deprived of its original form (Nos. 94 and 139)

(149) Innocentius de eodem: Sola peccata . . . credamus posse dimitti?[29]

Walter presumably found the text in some treatise whose author described a thought expressed by Pope Innocent.[30]

(150) Dicit Ambrosius non debere matrimonium imputari quod extra Dei decretum est, quia Deo fit conjugium.[31]

Not found in the *SMA*, the quotation, which finally took this form, was already cited in the *SA* (No. 47). The change also appears in Gratian's *Decretum* which

---

[20] P. Fournier, "Les coll. canoniques", 660 f.

[21] *Summa sent.* VII, 2; PL 176, 155D. The abbreviation *SS* will be used henceforth to designate the *Summa sententiarum*. The number in brackets designates the column in PL 176.

[21] *SS* VII, 2 (155D).

[22] Cf *De Sacr.* II, 11, 3; PL 176, 481D. *Sent.* IV, 26, 2; p. 912.

[23] *SS* VII, 3 (156A).

[24] *SS* VII, 3 (156C). See No. 14 of our list. Cf. *Sent. Berol.*; ed. Stegmüller, p. 57: Conjugalis concubitus, qui fit ob spem habendi filios, non est peccatum. Si vero causa explendae libidinis fiat, culpam quidem habet, sed venialem.

[25] *In I Cor.* vii, 2; PL 191, 1587A. *Sent.* IV, 31, 5; p. 939.

[26] *SS* VII, 4 (157B).

[27] *SS* VII, 8 (161A).

[28] *SMA*, fol. 50^{va}.

[29] *SS* VII, 8 (161A). Read *uxorum nomen* instead of *uxorum numerum*.

[30] Cf. *Decr.* VIII, 197 and 303; PL 161, 625C; 649C. Ivo, *Ep. CCXXX;* PL 162, 233C. Abelard, *Sic et Non*, 125; PL 178, 1548B.

[31] *SS* VII, 8 (161B).

reads: Ait Ambrosius: Non est imputandum matrimonium quod extra Dei decretum factum est sed, cum cognoscitur, emendandum.[32] Lombard simply added: ut quando fidelis infideli copulatur.[33]

(151) Clemens ex dictis Petri: Prima species adulterii . . . se servare viro.[34]
Walter met this text probably in a Penitential or in a canonical collection.[35]

(152) Haec auctoritas Hieronymi: Voventibus castitatem non solum nubere sed etiam nubere velle damnabile est.[36]
Walter makes the same assertion in a *letter to the disciples of magister Gilbert*.[37] It is based on an Augustinian text[38] transcribed by Abelard[39] and Hugh of St. Victor (No. 132). Gratian also ascribes the short excerpt to St. Jerome[40] while Lombard attached it to its authentic context: Voventibus enim virginitatem vel viduitatem non solum nubere . . . damnabile est.[41]

(153) Augustinus in libro *De Nuptiis et concupiscentia* his verbis: Istud credendum est quod beata Virgo . . . et aliter (agere) si ipse vellet.[42]
The quotation is not literal[43] but agrees almost verbatim with a text ascribed to the same source in his *letter to the disciples of magister Gilbert*.[44] At least the thought was known through another Augustinian statement from the same work in the *SMA*,[45] copied from Ivo of Chartres.[46]

(154) Beda in *Expositione super Lucam* videtur affirmare . . . vitam duceret virginalem.[47]
Bede's teaching[48] appears here for the first time and is later alluded to by Lombard.[49]

(155) Unde Leo: Non potest esse matrimonium, cum qua fuit adulterium.[50]
In this form the quotation appeared first in the *SA* (No. 80).

(156) Augustinus ita dicens in libro *De Nuptiis et concupiscentia*: Denique mortuo viro, cum (quo) verum connubium fuit, fieri (verum) connubium potest, cum quo prius adulterium fuit.[51]
We have noted the significance of this statement (No. 81) which is also cited by Abelard[52] but not in the known marriage treatises of the school of Laon. It occurs later in Gratian's *Decretum*[53] and Lombard's *Sentences*.[54]

(157) Hieronymus in Amandum scribens presbyterum sic dicit: Rem novam loquor . . . innupta permanere.[55]
We encountered this text first in the *SA* (No. 87) whose author did not prefix the erroneous title. Lombard[56] followed the *Summa sententiarum*.

---

[32] *Decr.* C. 28, qu. 1, prol.

[33] *Sent.* IV, 39, 2; p. 974.

[34] *SS* VII, 9 (161C).

[35] PL 56, 735B.

[36] *SS* VII, 10 (163B).

[37] Martène-Durand, *Vet. script. ampl. coll.* I (Paris, 1724), 839D. The Gilbert of this letter is Gilbertus Universalis according to L. Ott, "Unters. zur Briefl. der Frühscholastik", *Beiträge*, XXXIV (1937), 294.

[38] *De Bono vid.*, 9, 12; CSEL 41, 318.

[39] *Sic et Non*, 122; PL 178, 1543A.

[40] Gratian, *Decr.* C. 27, qu. 1, c. 41 and D. 27, c. 4.

[41] *Sent.* IV, 38, 2; p. 968. Cf. Gratian, *Decr.* D. 27 c. 4; Voventibus virginitatem non solum . . . damnabile est.

[42] *SS* VII, 10 (163B).

[43] Cf. *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 11, 12; PL 44, 421.

[44] Martène-Durand, 842E.

[45] *SMA*, fol 48va. *De Nupt. et conc.* I, 11, 12; PL 44, 420.

[46] *Pan.* VI, 16; *Decr.* VIII, 14; PL 161, 1247B; 586D. Ivo, *Ep. XCIX;* PL 162, 119B.

[47] *SS* VII, 10 (163B).

[48] *In Lucam* I, 34; PL 92, 318B.

[49] *Sent.* IV, 28, 3; p. 928.

[50] *SS* VII, 13 (165A). Cf. *Pan.* VII, 11; PL 161, 1282A. Gratian, *Decr.* C. 31, qu. 1, c. 1. *Sent.* IV 35, 4; p. 961: De hoc Leo papa ait: Nullus ducat in matrimonium quam prius polluit adulterio.

[51] *SS* VII, 13 (165B).

[52] *Sic et Non*, 131; PL 178, 1563C.

[53] *Decr.* C. 31, qu. 1, c. 2.

[54] *Sent.* IV, 35, 4; p. 961.

[55] *SS* VII, 19 (168D).

[56] *Sent.* IV, 35, 3; p. 960.

Among a total of some sixty-six texts or references in Walter's marriage tract, these fourteen excerpts show a definite but limited dependence on the source material offered by the school of Laon. Walter's personal initiative is also clearly reflected in the great variety of canonical texts derived from Ivo's collections. How many of them are directly transcribed from Ivo is an altogether different question to which here no definite reply can be given. It seems sufficiently obvious that Walter used a later recension of the *SA* and we may repeat that the number of patristic texts declined in the recensions as time went on.[57]

One unintentional result of this development was the marked decrease in the number of Augustinian excerpts and, in the case of Hugh and Walter, a noticeable increase of papal and conciliar decisions available in Ivo's collections. These were neglected, but not entirely ignored, by the compiler of the *SMA*.

On several occasions Walter of Mortagne felt called upon to express his views on certain particular problems related to marriage.[58] Of special interest is the appearance of a text quoted by his correspondent, Magister Albericus, against the consent-theory: *Nec est perfectum conjugium, nisi sequatur commixtio sexuum.*[59] The fact that Albericus does not ascribe it to St. Augustine indicates that he did not copy it from the *SMA* which had given so much weight to a spurious text by attributing it to the most illustrious name of the Latin Fathers.

VIII.

The time has come to propose some conclusions. It is undeniable that the second marriage treatise of the school of Laon, published in the *Sententiae Anselmi*, is inseparable from the *SMA*, because the former grew directly out of the latter. The assumption that the compiler of the *SMA* may have transcribed his texts from the *SA* fails to account for the greater length of texts in the *SMA*. After establishing the priority of the *SMA* over the *SA*, a comparative study of quotations leads to the conclusion that the treatise *DDf* is what H. Weisweiler claimed it to be, a recension of the *SA*. By employing the same method we reached the conclusion that the treatise (Nos. 90-111) edited by F. Bliemetzrieder and complemented by H. Weisweiler is what the editor claimed it to be, another later recension of the *SA*. The relationship is not reversed, as suggested by H. Weisweiler.

Thus the *SA* takes us to the very doorsteps of the school of Laon, because no older treatise is known. And if the *SMA* as a whole constitutes a unit, including not only the part on marriage we have examined more closely, it is legitimate to conclude that the collection existed prior to the *SA*. Who compiled it? A master of theology who was principally interested in such theological topics as the Trinity (and Incarnation), the Angels, the creation of man, the state of man before and after sin, the sacraments of marriage, Baptism (Confirmation), the Blessed Eucharist and Holy Orders. These were favorite subjects among the scholars of Laon and their followers who considered Anselm of Laon the glory of their age. So it may well be that the originator of the *SMA* was no other than Magister Anselmus himself.[60]

We have been able also to show that Hugh of St. Victor used the *SMA* not only in his section dealing with the Trinity but also in his tract on marriage. In this tract he also made use of a recension (Nos. 90-111) based directly on the *SA*. We could detect but little, if any, evidence to prove that Peter Lombard and Walter of Mortagne used the *SMA*. This is less surprising in Lombard's *Sentences*, written after the middle of the century, than in his earlier work, the commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul. We have, however, noted the indirect influence of the *SMA* on Lombard. Thanks to the lasting popularity of the *Sentences*, some excerpts survived the decline of the *SMA* as others did through their incorporation in Gratian's *Decretum*. A critical edition of the *SMA* would undoubtedly contribute a great deal to a deeper penetration into the far reaching activities of the school of Laon.

---

[57] O. Lottin, "Une source commune à la "Summa sententiarum" et aux "Sententiae Anselmi" ", *RTAM*, XVIII (1951), 188-204, claims to have found a source common to the *SS* and the *SA* in a treatise preserved in Munich, *Mss* (Clm) 4631 and 22307. Unfortunately, Lottin did not transcribe the patristic texts which would enable us to confirm or disclaim his thesis.

[58] Cf. L. Ott, "Unters. zur Briefl. der Frühscholastik", *Beiträge*, XXXIV (1937), 266.

[59] Martène-Durand, 838C.

[60] In his article on Alger of Liège, *Dict. de droit canonique* I (Paris, 1935), 400-402, A. Amanieu raises serious (textual) objections against the traditional opinion that *Magister A* is Alger of Liège. G. LeBras, "Alger de Liège et Gratien", *Rev. des sc. phil. et théol.*, XX (1931), 26, sees no decisive reason to assign the *SMA* to Alger.

The Papacy and Missionary Activity in the Early Middle Ages

RICHARD E. SULLIVAN

THE era in Western European history extending from 590 to about 900 perhaps had no more prominent feature than the gains won by missionaries for the Christian faith. Beginning with the pontificate of Gregory the Great the Christian frontier was pushed steadily forward until new barbarian invasions, the collapse of the Carolingian empire, and the secularization of the church temporarily interrupted this progress at the end of the ninth century. These gains were made in the face of great odds. Gregory the Great, writing to the Emperor Maurice in 595, dramatically posed the following picture of the task facing the Christian world: "Behold, all things in Europe are given over to the rights of barbarians. Cities are destroyed; castles are torn down; provinces are without people. No farmers inhabit the land. The worshippers of idols rage and domineer in the murder of the faithful. And still priests who ought to throw themselves weeping onto the pavement and the cinders, seek vain names for themselves and glory in new and profane words."[1] Gregory did not live to witness great burdens heaped upon Christendom by the Moslems, the Avars, the Saxons, the Norsemen, the Bulgars, and the Magyars, all of whom sought and often succeeded in circumscribing the Christian realm. Neither did he witness an internal collapse of the western political and ecclesiastical structure so serious that one of his successors, John VIII (872-882), was forced to beg the rulers of the West to assist in protecting Rome herself against invasions by the infidel Saracens and their Christian allies.[2] Nor did Gregory see the gradual bifurcation of what he seemed to think of as a single church into an eastern and a western church during the three centuries which followed his pontificate, creating a near schism which sometimes impeded missionary work.[3] These developments only highlight the magnitude of the achievement of the missionaries of the early Middle Ages.

The labor required to extend the Christian frontier during this era was shared by many groups. Among those was the papacy. In view of the repeated appearance of the papacy in the missionary record, certain questions arise, each having a bearing on missionary history and on the history of the papacy. How extensive was the papal contribution to the struggle against paganism? What was the exact nature of the papal contribution to the conversion of pagans? How did the papacy rank as a missionary agency when measured alongside other missionary agencies? Was there a continuity of papal missionary policy? This paper will attempt to shed some light on these questions by bringing together a record of papal missionary effort from 590 to 900 and by trying to evaluate the papal contribution to the total missionary effort of the era.

---

[1] *Gregorii I papae Registrum Epistolarum*, V, 37; ed. Paulus Ewald and Ludowicus M. Hartmann, MGH, Epistolae, I, 322: Ecce cuncta in Europae partibus barbarorum iuri sunt tradita, destructae urbes, eversa castra, depopulatae provinciae; nullus terram cultor inhabitat; saeviunt et dominantur cotidie in nece fidelium cultores idolorum; et tamen sacerdotes, qui in pavimento et cinere flentes iacere debuerunt; vanitatis sibi nomina expetunt et novis ac profanis vocabulis gloriantur. This collection will be cited hereafter as Gregory, *Reg.*, MGH, Ep., with appropriate volume, letter, and page numbers. The following abbreviations will be employed for other series in MGH: SS. for Scriptores; SS. rer. Merov. for Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum; SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol. for Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum.

[2] For examples of the way in which John VIII presented his plight see *Iohannis VIII. Papae Registrum* #1, 8, 22, 27, 31, 32, 33, 36, 56, 150, 193, 205, 263, 278; ed. Ericus Caspar, MGH, Ep. VII, 1-2, 7-8, 19-21, 25-26, 29-30, 31-32, 32-33, 35-36, 51-52, 126-127, 154-155, 164-165, 232-233, 245. This work will be cited hereafter as John VIII. *Ep.;* ed. Caspar, MGH, Ep. VII, with appropriate letter and page numbers.

[3] Louis Bréhier and René Aigrain, *Grégoire le Grand, les états barbares et la conquête arabe* (590-757) in *Histoire de l'église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours* V, ed. Augustin Fliche and Victor Martin (Paris, 1947), and Emile Amann, *L'Epoque carolingienne* in Fliche and Martin, *op. cit.*, VI (Paris, 1947), *passim*, for an account of the widening breach between Rome and Constantinople.

This study will be retracing familiar ground in the case of a few popes especially prominent in missionary history. It is the opinion of the writer that there has been an inclination to allow these well-studied cases to characterize papal missionary activity over the whole of the early Middle Ages. Such cases need to be set in proper perspective with the missionary activities of popes not so well-known and with the whole missionary effort of the period. Only by undertaking a complete account of papal missionary activity with an emphasis on the exact nature of the papal contribution can it be hoped that a more balanced version of the missionary role of the papacy may emerge.

I.

The missionary activity of Gregory the Great, perhaps the first pope to dispatch missionaries from Rome for the purpose of converting pagans,[4] makes the opening of his pontificate in 590 a significant point at which to begin a study of the papacy and missionary work. Gregory's part in the conversion of pagans, and especially the English nations, was so great that it remained a model for successful missionary ventures throughout most of the period under consideration. He himself sensed that his efforts were epoch making; in his *Moralia* he wrote as follows of the conversion of England: "By the shining miracles of His preachers has God brought to the faith even the extremities of the earth . . . Lo! the tongues of Britain, which before could only utter barbarous sounds, have lately learned to make the alleluia of the Hebrews resound in praise of God. Lo! the ocean, formerly so turbulent, lies calm and submissive at the feet of the saints, and its wild movements, which earthly princes could not control by the sword, are spellbound with the fear of God by a few simple words from the mouth of the priests; and he who, when an unbeliever, never dreaded troops of fighting men, now that he believes fears the tongues of the meek."[5] He wrote with pride to Queen Bertha of Kent that the news of the conversion of England was important enough to be heard as far away as Constantinople.[6] Some of the products of the conversion of England remembered well Gregory's contribution to the Christianization of their native land. Bede justified the introduction of a biographical sketch of Gregory into his *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* on the grounds that the English were the seal of the pope's apostleship, an honor that no other people could claim.[7] Boniface tried to secure copies of Gregory's letters of advice to the English mission to serve as guides for his own work in Germany.[8] Alcuin often referred to Gregory as "our teacher" and "our preacher."[9] Gregory's instructions to the English mission were referred to so often in succeeding ages that they assumed the force of canon law.[10] It would be difficult to find a modern historian who did not fully acknowledge the importance of Gregory's missionary work.[11] These testimonials demonstrate that Gregory played a decisive role in the missionary history of his day and thus introduced the papacy as a vital agency in missionary work for a long time thereafter.

---

[4] Kenneth Scott Latourette, *The Thousand Years of Uncertainty: A.D. 500-A.D. 1500* in *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* II (New York and London, 1938-1945), p. 61; Johannes Haller, *Das Papsttums. Idee und Wirklichkeit* I, verbesserte und erganzte Ausgabe (Urach and Stuttgart, 1950), p. 364.

[5] *Sancti Gregorii Magni Moralium Libri* XXVII, 11; PL 76, 411: . . . quia emicantibus praedicatorum miraculis, ad fidem etiam terminos mundi perduxit . . . . ecce a lingua Britanniae, quae nil aliud noverat, quam barbarum frendere, jam dudum in divinis laudibus Hebraeum coepit Allelula resonare. Ecce quondam tumidus, jam substratus sanctorum pedibus servit Oceanus, ejusque barbaros motus, quos terreni principes edomare ferro nequiverant, hos pro divina formidine sacerdotum ora simplicibus verbis ligant; et qui catervas pugnantium infidelis nequaquam metuerat, jam nunc fidelis humilium linguas timet.

[6] Gregory, *Reg.* XI, 35; MGH, Ep. II, 304-305.

[7] *Venerabilis Baedae Historica Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* II, 1 in *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica* I, ed. Carolus Plummer (Oxford, 1896), p. 73. This work will be cited hereafter as Bede, *Hist. eccl.*, with appropriate book, chapter, and page numbers.

[8] *S. Bonifatii et Lulli Epistolae* #33, 54, 75 in *Die Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und*

Although the English mission was the culmination of Gregory's missionary activities, he had attacked the problem of winning converts and had developed missionary techniques prior to the sending of a mission to England. His correspondence shows his awareness of several non-Christian elements in the realm under his sway and his sense of responsibility for converting them.

One troublesome situation that Gregory sought to correct was the persistence of pagan practices among those who were nominally Christian. Gregory's usual solution for this condition was to call the matter to the attention of those responsible for the spiritual life of such pagans, to reprimand them for their negligence, and to order them to destroy the remnants of paganism immediately. Bishops were most often the targets of papal reproofs. On several occasions Gregory wrote to bishops that he had heard that the worship of idols existed in their sees. He always ordered them to end this situation immediately, usually warning them that their own souls were in jeopardy because of their laxness.[12] Sometimes the pope suggested ways to fight against paganism. Venantius, bishop of Luna, was sternly warned in 599 to correct a situation reported by the *magister militum* of that city, who discovered that there were many in the city who desired to be ordained priests and deacons while at the same time the people living there were in need of the services of clergymen to recall them from infidelity and pagan worship. The bishop's duty was clear—he must provide more clergymen.[13] However, Gregory did not rest the matter with recalling the episcopate to its duty. He likewise asked lay rulers to end pagan practices. For instance, in September, 597, he wrote to Queen Brunehilda of the Franks in this fashion: "We likewise beg this, that you ought to restrain under the moderation of discipline certain of your subjects so that they will not worship idols, that they will not continue the worship of trees, and that they will not make sacrilegious sacrifices with the heads of animals, for it has come to us that many Christians frequent the churches . . . and do not cease to worship demons."[14] Occasionally Gregory requested a secular ruler to join hands with the bishops to discourage or destroy paganism.[15] His usual inducement to spur princes to action was the solemn promise of the pope himself that those who aided in this task would gain both praise in this world and eternal benefits in the

---

Lullus; ed. Michael Tangl, MGH, Epistolae Selectae I (Berlin, 1916), pp. 57, 96-97, 158, to be cited hereafter as Boniface, *Ep.;* ed. Tangl, with appropriate letter and page numbers.

[9] Alcuin, *Ep.* #124, 125, 128, 279; ed. Ernestus Dümmler, MGH, Ep. IV, 182, 184, 189, 436.

[10] See, for example, a letter of Pope Leo III in *Epistolae selectae pontificum Romanorum Carolo Magno et Ludowico Pio regnantibus scriptae* #5; ed. Karolus Hampe, MGH, Ep. V, 62; Hrabanus Maurus, *Ep.* #29, 31; ed. Ernestus Dümmler, MGH, Ep. V, 444-448, 455-462; Amalarius, *Ep.* #6; ed. Ernestus Dümmler, MGH, Ep. V, 251.

[11] For some typical examples see Erich Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft* II (Tübingen, 1930-1933), pp. 505-506, 668; Gustave Schnürer, *L'église et la civilisation au moyen âge* I, tr. G. Castella (Paris, 1933-1938), pp. 365-414.

[12] For examples see Gregory, *Reg.* III, 59; VIII, 1, 19; MGH, Ep. I, 218-219; II, 1-2, 21.

[13] Gregory, *Reg.* IX, 102; MGH, Ep. II, 110. For another example of Gregory's concern over providing enough clergy to wipe out pagan remains see Gregory, *Reg.* IV, 29; MGH, Ep. I, 263.

[14] Gregory, *Reg.* VIII, 4; MGH, Ep. II, 7: Hoc quoque pariter hortamur, ut et ceteros subiectos vestros sub disciplinae debeatis moderatione restringere, ut idolis non immolent, cultores arborum non existant, de animalium capitibus sacrificia sacrilega non exhibeant, quia pervenit ad nos, quod multi Christianorum et ad ecclesias occurrant et . . . a culturis daemonum non abscedant.

[15] Gregory, *Reg.* XI, 12; MGH, Ep. II, 273.

hereafter. Gregory even laid some of the responsibility for ending pagan practices on Christian landholders. In May, 594, he addressed a letter to *nobilibus ac possessoribus in Sardinia insula consistentibus*.[16] After speaking of how saddened he was to hear that many peasants (*rusticos*) in those parts were given to idolatry, he severely called the landholders to their duty. Since the serfs were given into their charge to work the land, the nobles owed them something in return, namely, the guidance which would lead them to eternal salvation. Cautioning the nobles that the end of the world and the day of judgment were at hand, the pope asked them to lead their charges to the true faith. He added, perhaps as a fillip to entice the nobles of Sardinia to do some noteworthy act, that he would like to hear by letter from any who had won converts.

Gregory was also aware that the religious state of the Lombards was not satisfactory. Aside from their Arianism, many of them remained pagan. He made this situation his concern. In this matter Gregory was faced with a complicated situation. Hard political reality demanded that he do nothing to give the Lombards an excuse to attack Rome. His broad policy of peaceful relations with them likewise dictated that he avoid religious strife.[17] Nonetheless, he could not refrain entirely from trying to convert the Lombards, whether they were Arians or still pagans. Again he relied on the bishops of Italy to bear the burden. The death of the Lombard king Autharith, an avowed enemy of the Roman church, prompted the pope early in 591 to address a letter to all Italian bishops exhorting them to try to get the Lombards to accept the orthodox faith.[18] In September of the same year he advised the bishop of Narni, a city in Lombard hands, to persuade both Lombards and Romans to abandon paganism and heresy and to accept the true faith. He thought the moment opportune because a plague had struck the city; it was obviously divine punishment for the errant ways of the populace, the only escape from which was the acceptance of the true faith.[19] Gregory himself tried to influence the Lombard court through Queen Theolinda, a Bavarian princess who was orthodox[20]—an effort that Gregory perhaps felt was rewarded when Theolinda's young son, Adoloald, was baptized in the orthodox faith in 603.[21]

Gregory was concerned with pagan threats more remote from Rome than the cases cited above. He was troubled over the Avar-Slav assault on the Balkan peninsula. His interest in this area was not so much a missionary one; rather, his chief efforts were bent toward saving the ecclesiastical structure there and toward protecting displaced clergymen. For example, in 591 he wrote to all of the bishops of Illyricum ordering them to receive and sustain any bishop who had been driven out of his see by the barbarian invasions.[22] The next year Gregory himself tried to provide for one such bishop. He wrote to John, bishop of Lissus, a city near Durazzo, ordering him to fill a vacant see in Calabria until his own city could be freed from its barbarian invaders.[23] Gregory also offered his encouragement to the civil authorities in these troubled areas. His order to the bishops of Illyricum, cited above, was a confirmation of an imperial order. In March, 592, he wrote a congratulatory letter to the praetorian prefect of Illyricum, who had recovered the province from the barbarians.[24] Even farther from Rome Gregory demonstrated an interest in winning new converts. In 593 he wrote a letter to Domitian, the metropolitan of Armenia, declaring his disappointment that the bishop's efforts to convert the emperor of Persia had failed, but consoling that ambitious bishop with assurances that his efforts were praiseworthy.[25]

---

[16] Gregory, *Reg.* IV, 23; MGH, Ep. I, 257-258.

[17] For a review of papal relations with the Lombards in this period see Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums* II, pp. 471-478; Bréhier and Aigrain, *Grégoire le Grand, les états barbares et la conquête arabe* (590-757), pp. 48-54.

[18] Gregory, *Reg.* I, 17; MGH, Ep. I, 23.

[19] Gregory, *Reg.* II, 4; MGH, Ep. I, 103.

[20] Gregory, *Reg.* IV, 4, 33; IX, 67; XIV, 12; MGH, Ep. I, 236, 268-269; II, 87-88, 430-432.

[21] Gregory, *Reg.* XIV, 12; MGH, Ep. II, 431.

[22] Gregory, *Reg.* I, 43; MGH, Ep. I, 69-70.

[23] Gregory, *Reg.* II, 37; MGH, Ep. I, 132-133.

[24] Gregory, *Reg.* II, 23; MGH, Ep. I, 120-121.

Whereas Gregory's efforts to win new converts in the above cases were chiefly in the form of exhortations, reprimands, reminders, and words of encouragement, his activities were more direct and more positive in at least two other cases, namely, in connection with the Jews and with a Sardinian tribe, the Barbaricini. With respect to the Jews Gregory adopted a policy of permitting their existence in Christendom on the basis of Roman law and of using his influence to prevent infringements on their rights.[26] For instance, he repeatedly forbade all attempts to interfere with Jewish religious practices, making himself available to hear the complaints of any Jewish individual or community that had been wronged.[27] He occasionally ordered Christians to make restitution to Jewish groups for interference with their rights.[28] He insisted that the Christian clergy refrain from forceful conversion of the Jews.[29] Gregory was equally insistent that the Jews confine their activities within legal bounds. He sought to prevent them from holding Christian slaves, gaining slaves by illegal means, leading Christians into sacrilege, taking revenge on converted Jews, or attempting to gain privileged status by bribery.[30]

This rather narrow legalism was constantly tempered by Gregory's anxiety to convert as many Jews as possible. To achieve this end he pleaded with his bishops to encourage with blandishments, admonitions, and persuasion the Jews in their dioceses to accept Christianity. He warned the bishops to avoid any compulsion, lest harshness and asperity harden the Jews against the true faith and lest those forced into baptism merely give lip-service to Christianity while retaining their old superstitions.[31] While encouraging the clergy to bend every effort to persuade the Jews to accept Christianity, Gregory himself sought actively to gain the attention of potential Jewish converts. He was apparently willing to listen to the problems of the Jews,[32] perhaps hoping to influence them personally by giving them an audience. He made it clear that Jews in slavery could gain their freedom by accepting Christianity and he insisted that various authorities see to it that such a reward was made possible.[33] He ordered the overseers of the papal patrimony to relieve the Jewish serfs of a part of their financial burden in return for accepting Christianity,[34] even offering in one case to write letters himself making such promises.[35] He personally ordered special subsidies for newly converted Jews.[36] He granted a man and his wife, who was formerly a Jewess, a special letter of protection against anyone who might do the new convert harm.[37] He ruled that the canonical rules of baptism be modified in order to accommodate Jewish converts. In this same case he even directed the local authorities to furnish the baptismal garb for those Jews who could not afford it themselves.[38] These acts of accommodation suggest that Gregory was convinced that the papacy had a vital role in encouraging the spread of Christianity. Its task was to incite those already Christian to present the teachings of Christianity to potential converts in an orderly, peaceful, non-provocative fashion, while the pope's own task was to use his power and prestige to encourage, reward, and protect those about to accept baptism and to make every concession possible to ease their transition from their former religion to Christianity.

---

[25] Gregory, *Reg.* III, 62; MGH, Ep. I, 223.

[26] Gregory, *Reg.* II, 6; VIII, 25; IX, 38, 40; MGH, Ep. I, 105; II, 27, 67, 68, for cases in which Gregory speaks of respecting the rights of Jews.

[27] Gregory, *Reg.* I, 34; II, 6; 1X, 195; XIII 15; MGH, Ep. I, 47-48, 105; II, 183-184, 383.

[28] See note 26, above.

[29] Gregory, *Reg.* I, 45; MGH, Ep. I, 71-72.

[30] For examples of Gregory's strictures to keep the Jews within the law see Gregory, *Reg.* II, 6; III, 37; IV, 9, 21; VI, 30; VII, 21; IX, 104, 213, 215, 228; MGH, Ep. I, 105, 195, 241-242, 255-256, 408, 464; II, 111-112, 199-200, 203, 223.

[31] Gregory, *Reg.* I, 34, 45; VIII, 23; MGH, Ep. I, 47-48, 71-72; II, 24-25.

[32] Gregory, *Reg.* I, 34, 45; II, 6; VIII, 25; IX, 38, 40; XIII, 15; MGH, Ep. I, 47-48, 71-72, 105; II, 27, 67, 68, 383.

[33] Gregory, *Reg.* IV, 9; VI, 29-30; MGH, Ep. I, 241-242, 407-408.

[34] Gregory, *Reg.* II, 38; MGH, Ep. I, 134.

[35] Gregory, *Reg.* V, 7; MGH, Ep. I, 288.

[36] Gregory, *Reg.* IV, 31; MGH, Ep. I, 267.

[37] Gregory, *Reg.* I, 69; MGH, Ep. I, 89.

[38] Gregory, *Reg.* VIII, 23; MGH, Ep. II, 24-25.

The Barbaricini, pagans living in the mountainous regions of Sardinia, provided Gregory with the problem of dealing directly with paganism on a larger scale than has been noted previously.[39] His personal intervention in this situation was prompted by the glaring neglect of these pagans by the local clergy and by the fact that the duke of Sardinia had inflicted a military defeat on them in 594. To capitalize on this situation Gregory sent an Italian bishop and a monk to Sardinia to bestir the Sardinian clergy into action and to discover and correct the sources of laxness. Their reports back to Rome on the conditions they found led Gregory to try to support their efforts. In May, 594, he dispatched four letters to Sardinia. One was a stinging rebuke to Januarius, bishop of Cagliari and principal clergyman in Sardinia, upbraiding him for his neglect in allowing paganism to exist in any area under his jurisdiction. In a slightly veiled threat Gregory promised that he would punish any Sardinian bishop in whose diocese he found a pagan. Gregory also wrote a letter to the landholders, ordering them to assume the responsibility for instructing their serfs and seeing to it that they were baptized. He also requested them to lend every possible assistance to his legates. A third letter was sent to Zaborda, the duke of Sicily, praising him for having subdued the Barbaricini and having exacted from them a peace treaty wherein they promised to become Christians. He exhorted the duke to complete what he had started by aiding in the conversion of his recent foes. Any efforts in that direction would glorify the duke in the eyes of both earthly princes and the heavenly King. Finally, Gregory wrote a letter to Hospito, the prince of the Barbaricini. Speaking in moderate language, the pope pointed out the folly of paganism and asked the prince to receive and aid the Italian clergymen who had come to convert his people. Gregory also asked Hospito to do whatever he could to make his subjects receive baptism. Gregory sent the blessings of St. Peter to Hospito as an inducement.

Gregory's efforts of 594 were not as successful as he had hoped. In June, 595, he took further action by writing to the Empress Constantina to report that the venality of the civil judges in Sardinia was impeding the work of his missions. In return for bribes these judges were freeing from penalty those guilty of pagan practices while exacting from new converts the price they had been paying previously to worship their pagan gods. Obviously the imperial government was expected to end these abuses. Still later, in October, 600, Gregory sent a letter to the *praeses* of Sardinia, Spesindeus, asking him to aid the local bishop in gaining converts. What the eventual fate of the Barbaricini was is not recorded; perhaps the lack of further information is proof of their conversion. Whatever the case, Gregory had taken the lead in trying to convert them. He had bent every effort to effect cooperation among his legates, especially charged to win converts, the local clergy, the civil authorities, the leader of the pagans, and the Christian landholders. Against such a combination paganism stood little chance. He advocated a method of gaining converts. The clergy, the landlords, and the civil authorities were encouraged to use persuasion and instruction on the pagans. The prince of those to be converted was asked to use his influence and his example in order to impress his subjects. Judicial proceedings were to be instituted against those who refused to be won by persuasion. Gregory himself was ready to use political sanctions against anyone who impeded the process. Apparently no other party except the papacy was interested or able to take the trouble to win even so small a victory for the faith.

The various attempts to win converts outlined above, most of which preceded the opening of the English mission, suggest that the latter undertaking was not nearly so unique as has sometimes been suggested. Gregory's activity prior to 596 indicates that he not only had an interest in missionary work but also had a rather broad concept of missionary technique. Nonetheless, his connection with the English mission marks his ultimate missionary achievement. To conceive of converting a people in a situation where his usual weapons—an ecclesiastical organization, a Christian majority, a civil administration that the pope could at least influence to some degree and that was unquestionably pro-Christian—were all lacking required a large amount of innovation and marked a new departure in papal policy.

---

[39] The following material relative to the Barbaricini is based on Gregory, *Reg.* IV, 23, 25, 26, 27; V, 38; XI, 12; MGH, Ep. I, 257-258, 260-262, 324; II, 273.

Gregory alone must be credited with the inauguration of the English mission and with entrusting the task to competent hands. No other agency had concerned itself with English paganism. Gregory complained, for instance, that the neighboring clergy had shown no interest.[40] Nor was there any convenient solution at hand for attacking the situation in England, as is obvious from the considerable thought given by Gregory to the problem of starting the conversion of England. However fanciful may be the story of his encounter with the Angle slaves in Rome and his consequent decision to try to convert them, it may be entirely possible that Gregory himself thought of going to England.[41] After that plan, if it ever existed, came to nothing, his next scheme centered around creating a troop of native clergymen, recruited from the continental slave markets and educated in Rome, to return to England as missionaries. In 595 he ordered Candidus, the rector of the papal patrimony in Gaul, to purchase English boys, baptize them, and transport them to Rome, where they were to be placed in monasteries so that they might be used in the service of God.[42] In the meantime he may have thought of trying to inspire the Gallic and Celtic clergy to act in England, as has been suggested above. Finally he decided to select monks in Italy for converting the English.[43] That choice was a propitious one; Gregory put his hands on a potent weapon in the Benedictine order, fired as it was with desire for the service of God, flexible enough in its organization to meet unusual situations, and disciplined enough to accomplish any task put to it by some guiding authority. Perhaps it is not amiss to say that Gregory performed no greater service for early medieval missionary activity than to encourage the Benedictine order to participate.[44]

Once having chosen a force for the actual missionary work, Gregory threw his efforts into getting his missionary party to its destination. This task was a relatively simple one, although a party of nearly forty monks was involved.[45] Apparently Gregory assumed that a group of monks, traveling under a papal commission, would be able to find suitable hospitality along the way to England without his making any special arrangements, since his correspondence contains no record of his having written any special letters to accompany Augustine and his companions when they left Rome the first time.[46] This assumption was sound, since the mission was well received by Protasius, bishop of Aix, Stephen, abbot of Lerins, and Arigius, patricius of Gaul.[47] But then there occurred an unforeseen development: a loss of heart within the mission, which was "seized by a sudden fear, and began to think of returning home, rather than to proceed to a barbarous, fierce, and unbelieving people, whose language they did not know."[48] Probably the missionaries heard stories of the magnitude of their task from those they met in Gaul which made it seem more serious than they had thought when they left Rome. Augustine returned to Rome. Gregory then acted firmly to save the mission. He put into Augustine's hands a strong rejoinder to the missionaries concerning their duty in the sight of God; one can assume he had spoken as firmly to Augustine in person. He called upon the missionaries as Benedictine monks to obey their abbot. And he spoke encouragingly of the favor that God would bestow on such a good work and of the eternal rewards the monks would gain for their efforts. This letter apparently convinced the party that it should proceed. As a further aid to the mission and perhaps as a demonstration of the importance he attached to the task, Gregory sent with Augustine special letters of commendation to important bishops along the route and to the Frankish rulers through whose territories the mission had to pass.[49] The pope called upon all of these personages to provide the material needs of the monks. Of the bishops he asked, in addition, that they offer their solace and their prayers. The Frankish rulers were called upon to protect the missionaries and to aid them in recruiting helpers for their task. These measures insured the arrival of the mission in England in May, 597. At least some indication that Gregory's letters had been important can be seen in a later papal letter written to Queen Brunehilda, one of those to whom a letter of commendation had been sent in 596, praising her for the help she had given to the mission as it passed through her territory.[50]

---

[40] Gregory, *Reg.* VI, 49, 57; MGH, Ep. I, 423-424, 431-432. It is difficult from the text to decide just who was meant by Gregory when he wrote that England was being neglected by neighboring clergy (sacerdotes e vicino, p. 423; sacerdotes qui in vicino sunt, p. 431). The editors of Gregory's correspondence state that the reference is to the clergy of Ireland; see *ibid.*, p. 423, note 2. However, a little farther on in each of these letters Gregory asks the Frankish royalty that his missionaries be permitted to recruit the aid of priests in Frankish territory. He uses exactly the same phrase, *e vicino*, in designating whence these clergymen are to be recruited. This leads me to believe that he felt that both the Frankish and the Irish clergy had been negligent.

[41] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* II, 1, pp. 79-80; "The Oldest Life of Pope St. Gregory the Great by a monk of Whitby," 9-10, in Charles W. Jones, *Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1947), pp. 103-104; Paul the Deacon, *Vita s. Gregorii magni*, 17-20; PL 75, 49-51; John the Deacon, *Vita s. Gregorii magni* I, 21-24; PL 75, 71-72.

[42] Gregory, *Reg.* VI, 10; MGH, Ep. I, 388-389.

[43] John the Deacon, *Vita s. Gregorii magni* II, 33; PL 75, 99.

[44] Schnürer, *L'église et la civilisation au moyen âge* I, 365-414, gives a good characterization of the significance of the union of papacy and Benedictine monasticism in missionary efforts.

[45] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* I, 25, p. 45, supplies this figure.

Unfortunately, the record is rather sparse concerning any further contributions on Gregory's part to the initial missionary venture in England. Nonetheless, there are certain hints that some thought had been given to the manner in which the missionaries were to proceed once they were in England and that Gregory was a party to these plans. Gregory himself wrote to Pelagius, bishop of Tours, and Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, that he had instructed Augustine, then on his way to England, to reveal to them more fully the affair in which the missionary was engaged.[51] This suggests some rather definite plans. Gregory had ordered Augustine to take interpreters from Frankish territories, again an intimation that plans had been made for dealing with the pagans.[52] Gregory had instructed Augustine to go to Arles for episcopal consecration in the event that he enjoyed success in England.[53] Implicit in such an order are certain considerations that must have been discussed prior to Augustine's departure: the organization of converts won, matters of discipline, the administration of property that might be acquired, the recruiting and ordination of native clergy, and the possibility of extending the missionary work to wider areas in England. When Augustine first arrived in England he was equipped with certain liturgical items which were used to make an impression on Ethelbert, including a silver cross and an image of Christ painted on a board.[54] It is fair to assume that these articles had been brought from Rome at Gregory's behest, since in 601 the pope sent more objects of this order to aid in missionary work.[55] To carry these items on the long trip from Rome suggests that plans had been made for their use. Bede says that Augustine wrote a letter in 597 to Gregory to gain "a solution of some doubts that occurred to him."[56] The implication of this remark is that Gregory and Augustine had already discussed some of the problems in question at an earlier date, before Augustine left Rome. At one point in his responses to Augustine's questions Gregory says that he thought he had already answered Augustine, but that he supposed Augustine desired to be confirmed in the papal opinion.[57] The referral of missionary problems to Rome in itself suggests that Gregory had invited, if not ordered, such a procedure before the missionaries left Rome for England.

---

[46] For instance, Gregory began a letter to Pelagius of Tours and Serenus of Marseilles, to whom he was commending Augustine, as follows: Licet apud sacerdotes habentes Deo placitam caritatem religiosi viri nullius commendatione indigeant . . . . (Gregory, *Reg.* VI, 50; MGH, Ep. I, 425).

[47] Gregory, *Reg.* VI, 53, 54, 56; MGH, Ep. I, 428-431, thanks each of these dignitaries for their kindness to the missionaries.

[48] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* I, 23, p. 42: . . . perculsi timore inerti, redire domum potius, quam barbaram, feram, incredulamque gentem, cuius ne linguam quidem nossent. See also Gregory, *Reg.* VI, 50a; MGH, Ep. I, 426; in this letter, addressed to the missionary party, Gregory orders: Nec labor vos ergo itineris nec maledicorum hominum linguae deterreant. . . .

[49] Gregory, *Reg.* VI, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57; MGH, Ep. I, 423-432. Bede, *Hist. eccl.* I, 24, pp. 43-44, adds Atherius of Lyons (whom he mistakenly designates as bishop of Arles) to this list.

[50] Gregory, *Reg.* VIII, 4; MGH, Ep. II, 6.

[51] Gregory, *Reg.* VI, 50; MGH, Ep. I, 425: Cui [i.e., Augustine] etiam ut promptiores ad suffragandum possitis existere, causam vobis iniunximus suptiliter indicare. . . . Bede, *Hist. eccl.* I, 24, pp. 43-44, says the same letter was sent to Atherius of Lyons.

[52] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* I, 25, p. 45: Acceperunt autem, praecipiente beato papa Gregorio, de gente Francorum interpretes.

[53] Gregory, *Reg.* VIII, 29; MGH, Ep. II, 30; Gregory, writing to Eulogius, bishop of

None of these pieces of evidence permits any certainty, but they lead one to the conclusion that Gregory had defined a regular program of action for his mission before it left Rome and that this program was followed. The appeal made directly to Ethelbert for permission to preach, the immediate organization of a monastic community at Canterbury, the careful attention given by the missionaries to their own personal conduct, the insistence that no compulsion be used to win converts, even after Ethelbert had been converted, the patient preaching to anyone that would listen, the rapid repair or building of churches—all cardinal features of the early success of the mission in England—may well have been the result of Gregory's instructions to his departing missionaries in 596. Just as he arranged for their safe passage to England, so also it is entirely possible that he was in large part responsible for their initial activities in that pagan land.

However true it may be that Gregory was responsible for the major portion of the program of Augustine's group, nothing can hide the fact that its success depended upon its reception in England and especially upon the attitude of Ethelbert. Gregory must have been aware of this fact, which meant that many matters were left undecided in 596, contingent upon the reception of Augustine in England. Thus there arose more opportunities for Gregory to act decisively in the conversion of the English.

Augustine enjoyed great success during his first years in England.[58] Not only was the king of Kent converted, but so also were large numbers of his subjects. Augustine felt encouraged enough to go to Arles to receive consecration as a bishop. Upon his return to England, he apparently was faced with problems that he could not dispose of himself nor could he rely upon his friend Ethelbert for their solution. Once again Gregory was called upon to contribute to the mission. In 597 two members of Augustine's mission presented themselves to the pope with a series of requests dealing with the future conduct of the mission.

Alexandria, says of Augustine: Qui data a me licentia a Germaniarum episcopis factus. . . . See also Bede, *Hist. eccl.* I, 27, p. 48.

[54] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* I, 25, pp. 45-46.

[55] *Ibid.*, I, 29, p. 63.

[56] *Ibid.*, I, 27, p. 48: simul et de eis, quae necessariae uidebantur, quaestionibus eius consulta flagitans.

[57] Gregory, *Reg.* XI, 56a; MGH, Ep. II, 338: Hoc non ambigo fraternitatem tuam esse requisitam, cui iam et responsum reddidisse te arbitror. Sed hoc quod ipse dicere et sentire potuisti, credo, quia mea apud te volueris responsione firmari.

[58] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* I, 25-27, pp. 44-48, describes the success of the mission.

Gregory's responses to this appeal were of fundamental importance in shaping the future development of Christianity in England.

One thing that Augustine needed was more missionary personnel.[59] His original party of forty did not suffice for the proper care of the increasing flock of converts and for the new churches that were being built. Gregory answered this request by sending a new group of missionaries from Rome in 601, including Mellitus, Justus, Paulinus, and Rufinianus;[60] the first three were to perform notable services in furthering the progress of Christianity in England. These reinforcements were given the usual papal letters of commendation to insure their passage to England.[61] It is difficult to imagine where else Augustine could have acquired such valuable aid than from Rome; again the pope had performed a vital missionary service.

Augustine also needed a variety of religious items to dedicate his new churches properly, to institute suitable religious service, and to educate those whom he had converted. When Gregory sent the new mission to England in 601, he also sent "by them whatever was necessary for the worship and services of the church, namely, sacred vessels and cloths for the altars, ornaments for the churches, and vestments for the priests and clerks, as well as relics of the holy apostles and martyrs and many books."[62]

The English mission was also uncertain as to how to proceed with the organization of the new church. Augustine transmitted several distinct problems to Rome with his legates in 597 and requested that Gregory order a procedure to be followed.[63] He was troubled about the kind of life the missionary party should follow, a problem apparently complicated by his own elevation to the episcopate, by the need to put his monks in charge of scattered churches, and by the entrance of certain recent converts into clerical life. Augustine asked for specific information about the disposition of church income, an issue that was perhaps new to a recently consecrated bishop and a recently converted king. He reminded the pope that he had no fixed see. New bishops might soon be needed; the matter of canonical ordinations was especially difficult, since Augustine was the only bishop in Kent. Augustine was also in doubt about his position relative to the Frankish and Celtic episcopacy.

Gregory resolved most of these problems on organizational matters in two letters which he sent to England in 601. The first, written on June 22,[64] prescribed a definite plan for the ecclesiastical organization of all England. Augustine was elevated to metropolitan rank, awarded the pallium, and assigned a see to be located at London. He was ordered to create twelve new bishops in his province as the opportunity presented itself. He was also directed to send a bishop to York as soon as possible so that another province with twelve suffragans could be erected there. Both new archbishops and their successors were to receive the pallium from Rome. The matter of supremacy was disposed of by authorizing Augustine to enjoy that position as long as he lived. Thereafter, whichever of the two archbishops was consecrated first was to be supreme.

In the second letter, written in July, 601,[65] Gregory made further provisions concerning the ecclesiastical organization of England and Augustine's position in it. The pope ordered that the English missionaries continue to follow a communal life. He also made special provisions for the maintenance and discipline of married members of the minor orders of the clergy, a body undoubtedly consisting of native converts who were now serving the new church. He instructed Augustine to make the traditional disposition of church income, that is, an equal division among the bishop and his household, the clergy, charitable activities, and the repair of churches. Augustine was given permission to consecrate new bishops without other bishops being present, as was required by canon law. He was also ordered to assume authority over all bishops in Britain. However, Gregory pointed out that the English archbishop had no rights over the Gallic bishops. These orders and directions permitted Augustine to begin the organization of his new converts. In 604 Justus was made bishop of Rochester and Mellitus bishop of London, the latter see being in the kingdom of the East Saxons and not suited for Augustine's metropolitan see.[66] However, Augustine failed to make any progress in establishing his authority over the bishops in the Celtic parts of the British Isles,[67] thereby falling short of Gregory's intentions. Nonetheless, the papal initiative was largely responsible for the first definite steps in organizing the church in England.

---

[59] Gregory, *Reg.* XI, 41; MGH, Ep. II, 315; Bede, *Hist. eccl.* I, 29, p. 63.

[60] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* I, 29, p. 63.

[61] Gregory, *Reg.* XI, 34, 38, 40, 41, 42, 47, 48, 50, 51; MGH, Ep. II, 303, 311, 314-316, 319-321, 322, 324.

[62] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* I, 29, p. 63: et per eos generaliter uniuersa, quae ad cultum erant ac ministerium ecclesiae necessaria, uasa uidelicet sacra, et uestimenta altarium, ornamenta quoque ecclesiarum, et sacerdotalia uel clericilia indumenta, sanctorum etiam apostolorum ac martyrum reliquias, nec non et codices plurimos.

[63] Gregory, *Reg.* XI, 56a; MGH. Ep. II, 332-343, contains Gregory's answers and also gives the exact questions asked by Augustine.

[64] Gregory, *Reg.* XI, 39; MGH, Ep. II, 312-313.

[65] Gregory, *Reg.* XI, 56a; MGH, Ep. II, 332-343.

While disposing of these problems Gregory also sent letters to both Ethelbert and Bertha of Kent.[68] There is no definite evidence that any difficulty had arisen between the rulers and Augustine. As a matter of fact, Gregory did Bertha the high honor of comparing her to Helen, the mother of Constantine, for the aid she had given his mission. Bede says that Ethelbert was always helpful in advancing the cause of the mission.[69] However, the tone of both letters hints that Augustine felt that the rulers could do more and had asked the pope to attempt to induce them to greater activity. The letter to Bertha stressed especially her responsibiliy to spur her husband to greater efforts for the faith. Gregory gently rebuked her for not having converted her husband sooner. He especially pleaded with her to aid Augustine and his workers. In his letter to Ethelbert the pope charged the king with more specific duties. After duly praising his conversion, Gregory recommended a definite program of action for the king to pursue in the future: "Therefore, glorious son, take care with a sollicitous mind of the grace you have divinely received. Hasten to extend the Christian faith among the people subjected to you. Multiply the zeal of your righteousness for their conversion. Suppress the worship of idols. Overthrow the temples. Edify the manners of your subjects by great cleanness of life by exhorting, terrifying, soothing, correcting, and illustrating by the example of good works, so that you will find your rewarder in heaven whose name and reputation you have spread on earth."[70] After inciting Ethelbert to emulate the example of Constantine, Gregory asked him to cooperate completely with Augustine and to follow the archbishop's orders in all things. Gregory thus charged the king with a major role in extirpating paganism and inducing his newly converted subjects to live a Christian life. Such aid would certainly have been of major importance to the still relatively small number of missionaries in Kent. Moreover, the whole letter takes on deeper significance when one notes that Ethelbert was addressed as "king of the Angles," that is, the ruler of all the inhabitants of England, and when one remembers that at the same moment Gregory had provided Augustine with a plan for organizing all England into an episcopal structure. Gregory was mustering the resources to spread missionary work beyond Kent, and was relying heavily upon Ethelbert to assist in that operation. Perhaps Augustine had not yet been able to persuade the king to throw his full efforts into the task of completing the conversion of the whole population of England.

---

[66] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* II, 3, p. 85.

[67] *Ibid.*, II, 2, pp. 81-85, for Augustine's dealings with the Celtic clergy.

[68] Gregory, *Reg.* XI, 35, 37; MGH, Ep. II, 304-305, 308-310.

[69] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* I, 25-26, pp. 44-47.

[70] Gregory, *Reg.* XI, 37; MGH, Ep. II, 308-309; Et, ideo, gloriose fili, eam quam accepisti divinitus gratiam sollicita mente custodi, christianam fidem in populis tibi subditis extendere festina, zelum rectitudinis tuae in eorum conversione multiplica, idolorum cultus insequere, fanorum aedificia everte, subditorum mores in magna vitae munditia exhortando, terrendo, blandiendo, corrigendo et boni operis exampla monstrando aedifica, ut illum retributorem invenias in caelo, cuius nomen atque cognitionem dilataveris in terra.

One final situation had developed during the early stages of the English mission with which Augustine and his fellow workers could not cope and which required papal guidance. When Laurentius and Peter came to Rome in 597, they brought with them an appeal to Gregory for instruction on a series of matters concerning the discipline of new converts. The missionaries had discovered that their knowledge of ecclesiastical regulations did not fit the cases that they had to deal with among their new converts. Gregory obliged them by supplying rather copious instructions in two letters sent to England in 601.[71] Throughout these letters he modified strict canonical regulations in order to fit the situation among those recently made Christians.

On problems of discipline the pope insisted on conformity to accepted norms as a general principle, but advised that too great severity be avoided. For those who stole from churches, he advised punishment tempered by charity. He ordered rather strict adherence to canonical regulations on marriages, although he permitted those who had contracted prohibited unions prior to their conversion to continue in these marriages: "For in this time the holy church corrects some things through fervor, tolerates other things through meekness, connives at still others through discretion. She thus carries on and connives so that she may often overcome the evil which works against her."[72] In matters of marriage Gregory stood on a single principle—only those that knowingly committed error should be punished. Otherwise, the task of the missionaries was to act charitably while trying to enlighten. Gregory also tried to lay down for the missionaries certain acceptable practices relative to sexual relations and childbirth, especially as these matters had a bearing on attendance at church services and reception of the sacraments. He was especially eager to caution his missionaries against too great reliance on Old Testament rules as final guides in these matters, perhaps feeling that their monastic way of life would make them too hard on the pagans.

Gregory was especially sollicitous to encourage the development of a ritual that would satisfy those who had recently left paganism. His emphasis on this matter suggests that he felt that an adequate ritual was absolutely necessary to insure the allegiance of the new converts to Christianity. He advised Augustine to use whatever of the Roman and Gallic rites that he found most suitable. Even more significant was the papal injunction to the missionaries not to attempt to cut away all remnants of pagan ritual immediately but rather to permit certain ancient practices under a Christian guise. Temples ought not be destroyed; they should be converted into churches by purifying them with holy water, constructing altars, and depositing relics. Gregory virtually sanctioned the sacrifice of animals in honor of the Christian God, thus permitting the new converts to continue one of their most ancient practices. He encouraged the missionaries to permit the performance of various other pagan rituals in honor of the saints, thus sanctioning a degree of polytheism for worshippers who had long been accustomed to dealing with a multitude of deities.

How thoroughly the English missionaries followed papal advice in matters of discipline and ritual is nearly impossible to determine. Perhaps it is safe to suggest that Gregory's instructions were followed since the missionaries had sought his guidance. If such were the case, one must again credit Gregory with a major role in carrying through the mission to England. Once the missionaries had harvested the fruits of the first enthusiasm for Christianity, they faced the more difficult and perhaps more important task of imposing on the converts a Christian standard of morals and mode of worship. The papacy was ready with common-sense advice on specific problems. More significantly Rome counseled a general strategy in dealing with disciplinary problems—a program of moderation, patient instruction, tolerance, and progress by easy stages.

---

[71] The following is based on Gregory, *Reg.* XI, 56, 56a; MGH, Ep. II, 331-343.

[72] Gregory, *Reg.* XI, 56a; MGH, Ep. II, 336: In hoc enim tempore sancta ecclesia quaedam per fervorem corrigit, quaedam per mansuetudinem tolerat, quaedam per considerationem dissimulat atque ita portat et dissimulat, ut saepe malum quod adversatur portando et dissimulando compescat.

Less than three years after Gregory sent new missionaries and a whole set of new plans for further progress to the English mission, he died. A brief review of his efforts will show that he contributed decisively to missionary success in England at two crucial stages—at its beginning and at the moment when many conversions had offered a real hope for a magnificent victory over paganism, but when organization and discipline were necessary to seal the victory. Those contributions would certainly permit one to say that the papal role in missionary work had been great. Still it would be amiss to overlook one more role that Gregory played in the greatest missionary effort of his era. His persuasions and exhortations gave urgency and importance to missionary work. His letters are filled with references to what must have been a powerful idea in his age, namely, that any assistance to missionary activity was worthy of special notice in the sight of God. This assurance, vouched for by the pope's own word, was extended to the monks who set out for England but faltered in Provence. It was promised to Frankish bishops and Frankish kings for whatever they might do for missionaries. It was proffered to English royalty for their assistance. No one could doubt that he was helping in a good work of major proportions after he had received such papal assurances. Gregory's exaltation of missionary work did not stop at promises of eternal reward. He never forgot the earthly ambitions of men. He assured kings that their earthly fame would grow as they assisted in spreading the faith. He permitted them to think that they were performing a service to God's cause as great as that of Constantine or of the fabled Helen. On other occasions he highlighted the sanctity of missionary work by stern reminders that failure might have tragic results. For instance, in a somewhat inexplicable letter to Augustine in 601,[73] he cautioned his emissary against too great pride and contentiousness, lest these sins undo his work as a missionary. He chided Queen Bertha and his own missionary party with the ignominy of failing a great work once undertaken. In effect, Gregory manufactured a zeal for missionary work in Western European circles that had not yet developed that zeal to any great degree—the established episcopate, Benedictine monastic circles, royal houses. This psychological factor, which perhaps no one except the pope could have created at this particular moment, was certainly a key element in the progress of the Christian frontier in Gregory's day and in years that followed his pontificate.

II.

The passing of Gregory marked a decline in papal missionary activity. The next century of missionary history shows nothing comparable to his vigorous, decisive actions in beginning the conversion of England and in ending pagan remains in the already Christianized world. One is tempted to think that the retreat of the papacy from its position of missionary leadership was due primarily to the fact that for a long time the papal office lacked a personality as great as Gregory. Certainly there was no lack of opportunity for a continuation or repetition of Gregory's kind of leadership. Only Kent and Essex in England had been touched by Rome's missionaries in 604. The continental Christian world was surrounded by Germanic paganism. Slavic hordes were in the process of

[73] Gregory, *Reg.* XI, 36; MGH, Ep. II, 305-308.

occupying the Balkan area. However, other factors undoubtedly explained papal inactivity in the missionary history of the seventh century. The troubled relationship between papacy and Byzantine Empire and between papacy and Lombards consumed the major share of papal energy. The almost negligible role that the papacy was able to take in the affairs of the Frankish national church shut the See of Rome off from any real chance to consider missionary schemes in the Germanic world. Perhaps another Gregory would have circumvented these difficulties. But the seventh century produced no pope capable of matching his efforts, and so the papal missionary record was not impressive.

Almost all papal missionary activity in the seventh century was limited to England. Even there papal policy was dilatory and indecisive, confined largely to approving gains made by other agencies and to offering encouragement to those involved in missionary work. On only one occasion did the papacy inaugurate a new mission after the fashion of Gregory. In 634 Honorius I (625-638) sent Birinus to England, the latter "having promised in his presence that he would sow the seed of the holy faith in the inner regions beyond English parts, where no teacher had gone before."[1] Birinus was consecrated by Asterius, archbishop of Milan, upon papal orders. He decided to labor among the pagan West Saxons. He succeeded well enough to become bishop of Dorchester. However, Rome had nothing further to do with its agent. Christianity progressed among the West Saxons under the auspices of King Cenwahl, who had refused to accept Christianity from Birinus but had later been converted while a refugee in East Anglia; the king probably became a Christian for political reasons. Irish and Gallic influences were much greater among the West Saxons than was Roman influence during this critical period. Other than this one case the progress of Christianity in seventh-century England resulted from the initiative of kings, and especially the Northumbrian house, of Irish monks, and of Gallic clergymen.[2] Rome played only a minor role in this development.

Perhaps the failure of the papacy to continue to exercise leadership in the conversion of England resulted from the policy laid down by Gregory. He had envisioned a spread of Christianity from Kent, as was evident both in his elaborate scheme of episcopal organization of 601 and in his charge to Ethelbert, "king of the Angles." Gregory probably hoped to enlist the missionary services of the Irish by putting Ireland under the authority of the archbishop of Canterbury.[3] The papal plan was based on the political hegemony enjoyed by Kent at the beginning of the seventh century. That situation was not permanent. As a result the Kentish religious establishment was overshadowed along with Kentish political power. The seventh-century papacy made little attempt to adapt its policy to the changing environment in England.

The missionary activities of Gregory's successors were very largely tied to the Kentish church. Several seventh-century popes made some attempt to encourage and promote the Kentish establishment. They usually took care to send the pallium to the bishop chosen for the see at Canterbury, thus insuring each archbishop the proper dignity to spread the faith and investing each with the power to create suffragans.[4] Both Boniface IV (608-615) and Honorius I sent letters of encouragement to archbishops Mellitus, Justus, and Honorius.[5] Boniface IV's letter to Justus was filled with praise for his work and with assurances that his reward would be great in heaven. Honorius I, in a letter of almost the same kind to Honorius of Canterbury, especially encouraged the archbishop to be zealous in following the guidance of Gregory the Great and to be eager in strengthening the faith of new converts. In 610 Boniface IV received Mellitus, then bishop of London, who had come to Rome from England "about the necessary affairs of the English church." Mellitus was permitted to take a place at an episcopal synod held in Rome during his stay. Upon his return to England he carried with him the decrees of that synod so that they might be observed there. The missionary clergy was thus still relying on Rome for the settlement of difficult problems. Boniface also sent back with Mellitus letters to the archbishop Laurentius and his clergy, to King Ethelbert, and to the English people; very likely these letters contained orders to abide by papal decretals as well as answers to the problems which provoked Mellitus' journey.[6] Bede credits both Honorius I and John IV (640-642) with attempts to end the difficulties dividing the Roman clergy in England and the Celtic church.[7] Such a move certainly had missionary implications. Apparently the papacy had not abandoned Gregory's policy of bringing the Celtic church under the sway of Rome through the Roman-inspired organization in Kent. However, this meager collection of cases where the papacy in any way played a part in ecclesiastical life in Kent over a period of nearly fifty years, stretching from the death of Augustine (609?) to the death of Honorius of Canterbury (653), is not in the least impressive. These were years when the Kentish group needed assistance. For instance, at the death of Ethelbert in 616 a pagan reaction nearly overthrew the whole establishment.[8] It would seem that the papacy felt incapable of doing anything more for Gregory's establishment.

---

[1] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* III, 7, p. 139: promittens quidem se illo praesente in intimis ultra Anglorum partibus, quo nullus doctor praecessisset, sanctae fidei semina esse sparsurum. The following is based on *ibid.*, pp. 139-141.

[2] The essential source is Bede, *Hist. eccl.* II-IV, *passim*, pp. 73-280. See also R. H. Hodgkin, *A History of the Anglo-Saxons* I (Oxford, 1935), pp. 268-302; William Hunt, *The English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest (597-1066)* (London, 1912), pp. 76-116; Bréhier and Aigrain, *Grégoire le Grand, les états barbares et la conquête arabe (590-757)*, pp. 289-316.

[3] Gregory, *Reg.* XI, 37, 39, 56a; MGH, Ep. II, 308-310, 312-313, 331-343.

[4] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* II, 8, 17, 18, pp. 95-97, 118, 120-122.

[5] *Ibid.*, II, 7, 8, 18, pp. 93-97, 120-122.

Occasionally, but not consistently, the papacy tried to encourage the spread of the faith beyond Kent, as the first mission had envisioned. The struggle to spread Christianity to the East Saxons and the East Angles, both of which areas were closely associated with the Kentish church, did not concern Rome.[9] On the other hand, Pope Honorius I acted vigorously to bring about the conversion of Northumbria. The opening of the Northumbrian mission was not the result of papal initiative. Edwin of Northumbria's desire to strengthen his alliance with the royal house of Kent presented an opportunity to introduce Christianity into Northumbria. Edwin was allowed to marry Ethelberga of Kent only on the condition that priests be allowed to accompany her and that her husband would consider accepting Christianity. Paulinus, one of the monks Gregory had sent into England in 601, was assigned to accompany Ethelberga. He was consecrated bishop by Justus in 625, a step obviously fitting him for a greater role that that of chaplain for the queen.[10] The Kentish church had finally found an opportunity to carry out Gregory's plans to extend the faith outside its original seat in southeastern England.

The papacy entered the scene only after the Kentish clergy had established a foothold in Northumbria. Boniface V (619-625) wrote two powerful letters to Northumbria to appeal to Edwin and Ethelberga.[11] It has usually been presumed that the pope wrote these letters to promote the cause of Paulinus. Boniface did not indicate clearly that he was aware of the full situation in Northumbria. He knew of Ethelberga's marriage, of Edwin's paganism, and of his refusal to "yield obedience or give ear to the voice of the preachers." Since he knew of the marriage, he presumably knew of Paulinus' presence in Northumbria. The letters, however, make no mention of Paulinus. Neither is there a letter of commendation designed to give papal blessings to a missionary whose task it is to present the case for the new religion. Instead Boniface attempted by direct argument to persuade the royal pair to support the conversion of England. In the letter to Edwin Boniface stated that he "thought fit to extend our priestly care to make known to you the fullness of the Christian faith . . . ,"[12] suggesting that the papacy felt that it had the duty and the power to affect conversions on its own. Boniface then stated the case for Christianity. He began with a discussion of the power of the Christian God, creator of all things and ruler of all things, including earthly kingdoms. He especially tried to demonstrate that the power of the kings of Kent was a result of their conversion. The pagan deities and rituals to which Edwin was a victim were excoriated by Boniface. Finally, he presented a strong case for the eternal rewards that could come to Edwin only if he accepted Christianity. The pope sent the pagan king a shirt with a golden ornament and a garment of Ancyra as a demonstration of his friendship. This letter, so strongly flavored with religious arguments in favor of Christianity and opposed to paganism, represents an addition to papal missionary weapons. It represents the first instance of direct papal appeal to a pagan king asking him to accept a superior religion and presenting him with a reasoned argument for such a move. The letter to Ethelberga was more conventional, being primarily an appeal to her, a Christian, to assume the responsibility for converting her husband. Boniface told her to strive for this noble goal by her prayers, by insinuating divine precepts into the king's mind, and by informing him of the rewards that he might gain by becoming a Christian. The pope asked the queen to inform him of her progress so that he might return thanks to God and St. Peter.

---

[6] *Ibid.*, II, 4, p. 88.

[7] *Ibid.*, II, 19, pp. 122-124.

[8] *Ibid.*, II, 5-6, pp. 89-93.

[9] *Ibid.*, III, 18-20, 22-23, pp. 162-169, 171-177.

[10] *Ibid.*, II, 9, pp. 97-100, for the circumstances marking the opening of the Northumbrian mission. It is not unlikely that Edwin was contemplating accepting Christianity prior to his marriage; at least Bede suggests that he had contacted Christianity during his exile in East Anglia prior to his victory over Ethelfrith in 616 and his accession to power in Northumbria; see *ibid.*, II, 12, pp. 106-112.

[11] For the texts of these two letters see *ibid.*, II, 10-11, pp. 100-106.

Whether this papal action had an effect on the conversion of Edwin is unknown. Bede's account of his acceptance of Christianity and its subsequent spread in Northumbria makes no mention of papal influence in the process. Rather he stresses the skill of Paulinus and the zealous assistance of Edwin as the determining factors.[13] Not until 634 did the papacy again act with reference to Northumbria. Perhaps there was no need for papal action prior to this. Apparently Paulinus followed the missionary pattern established in Kent, preaching, baptizing, ordaining priests, building churches, and destroying pagan temples. Whatever problems arose might well have been disposed of on the basis of precedents established in Kent, with which Paulinus had been closely associated, or in consultation with the present clergy of Kent, well versed in missionary problems. The papacy acted in Northumbria only when the mission had reached the point where organization became a necessity in order to make permanent the first successes. In 634 Honorius I elevated Paulinus to the rank of archbishop and sent him a pallium. He also ordered that York be Paulinus' archiepiscopal see and that it be co-equal with that of Canterbury.[14] This was in effect an order for Paulinus to begin creating bishoprics in Northumbria and to proceed toward the completion of the plans of Gregory I. Honorius also wrote once again to Edwin to encourage him to continue his support of the true religion in his realm and to incite him to a more perfect practice of Christianity, especially by reading the works of Gregory the Great.[15]

Unfortunately, Honorius wrote these letters without knowing that Edwin had fallen at the battle of Hatfield or that Paulinus had fled to Kent and had apparently abandoned hope of returning to Northumbria, since he accepted the bishopric of Rochester.[16] The one serious attempt made to convert more of England from a base in Kent had failed, certainly leaving the papacy with little glory as a missionary agency. Northumbria reverted to paganism for some years. It was then reconverted permanently by Irish clergy whose source of guidance was not Rome. Nor did the Irish confine themselves to Northumbria. With the backing of Oswald and Oswy Irish influences spread into several other kingdoms, whose conversion and organization progressed rapidly around the middle of the seventh century.[17] The papacy had no part in all of these affairs; perhaps one might conclude that it had no interest. Even Rome's great victory at Whitby was won without any direct action by the papacy. The papal cause was borne by personalities like Wilfrid, a native Northumbrian and a product of the Irish monastery at Lindesfarne, Eanfled, the wife of Oswy, Agilbert, the Frankish bishop who had served as bishop of Dorchester in West Saxony, all of whom seem to have received their original inspiration to serve Rome and its ecclesiastical ways by some connection with Kent.[18] Only in Kent did the papacy retain a relatively active influence, and even there its activity was limited.

---

[12] *Ibid.*, II, 10, p. 101: ad adnuntiandam uobis plenitudinem fidei Christianae sacerdotalem curauimus sollicitudinem prorogare. . . .

[13] *Ibid.*, II, 12-16, pp. 106-118.

[14] *Ibid.*, II, 18, pp. 120-122; this letter is to Honorius of Canterbury in which Pope Honorius reveals his actions in the north.

[15] *Ibid.*, II, 17, pp. 118-120.

However, the rather uninspiring record of papal participation in the progress of Christianity in seventh-century England must not hide at least one papal act of decisive importance in the conversion of the English—the sending of Theodore of Tarsus to England as archbishop in 667. All the evidence suggests that this act was decided upon by Rome on its own initiative and that the decision was made with a clear purpose in mind, namely, the solution to several grave problems bearing on the organization and discipline of the new English church. The drift of affairs[19] in England prior to 667 was disturbing in spite of the steady addition of new converts, the occasional creation of new bishoprics, the foundation of new monasteries, and the dissolution of the struggle between the Roman and Celtic forces. There was a trend toward the establishment of national churches headed by independent bishops. Most episcopal sees were too large. There was an obvious lack of coordinated action among the bishops. Discipline was not rigorously maintained. The last of the Romans who had been connected with Gregory's first mission were gone; for instance, in 653 Honorius was succeeded as archbishop of Canterbury by a West Saxon, Frithonas, who assumed the name Deusdedit.[20] To make the whole situation worse a plague decimated the clergy of England about the time of the council of Whitby.[21]

The English were certainly aware of their own difficulties. Oswy of Northumbria and Egbert of Kent apparently decided to take some decisive action to correct the situation. Their plan consisted in installing someone in the vacant see at Canterbury who would restore order in the whole of England. The man of their choice was Wighard. Feeling that he would need special authority, they sent him to Rome, an unprecedented act in the history of the English church. Wighard bore with him letters which apparently revealed the intentions of the kings.[22] However, before Pope Vitalian (657-672) could do the bidding of the kings, Wighard died. Thereupon the pope took matters in his own hands. He sent a letter to Oswy speaking as follows on the matter of the archbishop: "We have not been able now to find, considering the length of the journey, a man docile and qualified in all respects to be a bishop according to the tenor of your letter. But as soon as such a suitable person will be found, we will send him with instructions to your country, so that he may by word of mouth and through divine oracles and with divine consent root out all the enemy's tares throughout your island."[23] In these words the papacy demonstrated a revival of Gregory's bold policy toward England. In the hands of a man of its own choice, instructed in his task by the pope himself, lay the solution to England's grave religious problems. Vitalian was confident that papal influence was great enough in England to assure the acceptance of an archbishop of his choice and that the pro-Roman sentiment was well enough entrenched to secure conformity to any regulations imposed from Rome. Vitalian picked his man carefully, settling finally on the learned and virtuous monk Theodore. Apparently Theodore was told what he must do, since Vitalian sent Hadrian with him to watch that he did not veer from orthodoxy and since a few years later a certain abbot named John was sent to England by order of Pope Agatho (678-681) to inquire concerning the condition of the faith in England and to report his findings to Rome.[24]

---

[16] *Ibid.*, II, 20, pp. 124-126.

[17] Bede supplies the essential account of this missionary effort in *ibid.*, III, *passim*, pp. 127-200.

[18] See Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums* II, pp. 676-689, for a description of the formation of a pro-Roman party in Northumbria and for the antecedents of the members of that party.

[19] Hunt, *The English Church (597-1066)*, pp. 128-131.

[20] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* III, 20, p. 169.

[21] *Ibid.*, III, 27, 30; IV, 1, pp. 191-192, 199-200, 201-202, for some of the drastic effects of this pestilence.

[22] Bede's account of the sending of Wighard to Rome seems to indicate clearly that the two kings had a plan in mind; see *ibid.*, III, 29; IV, 1, pp. 196-199, 201.

The papal action was decisive in the completion of the Christianization of England. To inject into the English scene at this crucial moment a figure who had no prior involvement in either the political struggles or the ecclesiastical structure of England and who had a clear concept of what was needed to be done was a highly important step toward completing the organization and perfecting the discipline of the newly converted nations. Theodore's often described program need not be reviewed here in detail.[25] Let it only be said that his policy of creating new bishoprics of manageable size, of subordinating them to a metropolitan, of holding regular synods, of instituting uniform regulations for clergymen and laymen, of promoting a thorough educational program in order to create an adequate native clergy, of conducting regular episcopal visitations, of spreading a uniform liturgy all savor of Roman influence and inspiration. By the time of Theodore's death in 690 missionary efforts in England were no longer necessary. Gregory's dream of bringing the pagan Anglo-Saxons to sing alleluias in praise of Christ was a fact, due in no little part to the efforts of him and his successors.

The record of papal participation in the Christianization of England during the seventh century would not be complete without some reference to an indirect, intangible, yet powerful contribution made by the papacy. It is next to impossible to fashion an adequate description of what Englishmen of all orders seemed to draw from their own contacts with Rome and the see of St. Peter by way of inspiration and zeal for the Christian way of life. Yet no one could tell the story of the progress of Christianity in England without introducing this factor. The attraction that Rome had for Englishmen shaped the destiny of many of them, causing kings to lay down their crowns to spend their last days at the see of St. Peter, compelling clergymen to take every opportunity to make a pilgrimage to the Englishmen's holy of holies, encouraging numerous men of lesser position to leave behind family and property to die in the holy city.[26] Such an attraction must surely have played a role in making the English subservient to Rome's orders and suggestions and zealous to emulate the religion sponsored by Rome's bishop. Perhaps Bede's account of the council of Whitby illustrates how decisive was the papal reputation during this century. He recounts that Wilfrid won the day for Rome by using the argument that St. Peter and his successors were keepers of the keys to heaven to counteract the Celtic argument that their customs were held on the authority of St. Columba. It was this point that won Oswy to the Roman position and forced the Celt, Colman, to concede Rome's supremacy.[27] Here was a force operating in men's minds that stemmed from Rome and played a key role throughout the period of conversion.

---

[23] *Ibid.*, III, 29, pp. 197-198: Hominem denique docibilem et in omnibus ornatum antistitem, secundum uestrorum scriptorum tenorem, minime ualuimus nunc repperire pro longinquitate itineris. Profecto enim dum huiusmodi apta reppertaque persona fuerit, cum instructum ad uestram dirigemus patriam, ut ipse et uiua uoce, et per diuina oracula omnem inimici zizaniam ex omni uestra insula cum diuino nutu eradicet.

[24] For the careful choice of Theodore with its implication of equally careful instruction, see *ibid.*, IV, 1, pp. 202-204; for the papal concern over checking Theodore, see *ibid.*, IV, 1, 18, pp. 202-203, 240-242.

[25] Hodgkin, *A History of the Anglo-Saxons* I, pp. 303-366; J. H. Maude, *The Foundations of the English Church* (London, 1909), pp. 139-191; Hunt, *The English Church (597-1066)*, pp. 132-161.

[26] For a brief discussion of the numerous pilgrimages to Rome by the English and of the larger issue of the influence of St. Peter's on English thinking, see Haller, *Das Papsttums* I, pp. 371-383.

At times its operation had a direct influence on the actual conduct of ecclesiastical affairs in England. The case of Wilfrid illustrates this well. It was his five year stay in Gaul and in Rome after he had been educated at Lindesfarne under Irish influence that inspired him to play his important role as founder of monasteries, converter of pagans, bishop and archbishop, and constant protagonist for Roman observances and ideas in England.[28] Even a better case in point is the career of Benedict Biscop.[29] Giving up a promising worldly career in the service of Oswy, this young nobleman decided to follow the religious life. Whereupon, he left England in 653 to see Rome and to worship where the bodies of the holy apostles lay. Returning to England he took up the religious life with great zeal. In about 665 he set out again for Rome as a companion of Alchfrid, the son of Oswy. Although the young prince was recalled, Benedict went on. He spent several valuable months in Rome, whereupon he withdrew to Lerins to become a monk, perhaps at papal instigation. Leaving Lerins he again returned to Rome in time to be commissioned papal guide for Theodore and Hadrian. After a brief pause in England Benedict made his fourth trip to Rome. His main purpose this time was to obtain books. Upon his return he found his way back to Northumbria, prepared for his most important work, the foundation of Wearmouth and Jarrow. For this task Benedict was ready with monastic rules, books, and relics, the fruits of his numerous trips to Rome and the continent. A necessary grant of land was made by the Northumbrian king and the monastery was built with technical help from Gaul. Benedict still did not have and could not secure in England all he needed to complete his monastery. Therefore, he made his fifth trip to Rome, returning with more books, relics, a papal privilege for his monastery, a variety of art objects to decorate his new church, and a Roman monk named John, sent by Pope Agatho to teach the correct Roman liturgical usages. Benedict made still another trip to Rome before the end of his life, again in search of books and materials to adorn his two monasteries. Here was a man shaped largely under the influence of Rome. Benedict Biscop himself sought out this guidance, constantly being attracted to the holy see for whatever he needed to achieve the kind of ecclesiastical career he desired. The contribution made by his monasteries, shaped under Roman influences, to the intellectual history of England needs no discussion when one recalls the career of Bede, a direct product of Wearmouth and Jarrow, or of Alcuin, a product of the episcopal school at York, which was an offshoot of Biscop's establishments. Both Wilfrid and Benedict Biscop, and certainly many more whose careers are not so well known, can thus be called products of papal influence in England. Although the papacy made no special effort to influence these men, still its great reputation in England attracted them and created the opportunity for them to be influenced. They in turn put what they gained in Rome to practice in England. In this indirect way the papacy played an important part in incorporating England into the Christian world and in causing the English church to develop along certain lines.

---

[27] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* III, 25, pp. 181-189.

[28] Eddius Stephanus, *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, text, translation, and notes by Bertram Colgrave (Cambridge, 1927), for Wilfrid's connections with Rome.

[29] The following is based on Bede, *Historia Abbatum*, 1-13 in *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica* I, ed. Carolus Plummer (Oxford, 1896), pp. 364-377.

The record traced above demonstrates that the papacy was never completely removed from English missionary affairs in the seventh century and sometimes acted decisively to affect the progress of the conversion and organization of England. In contrast, its participation in seventh-century continental missionary affairs was almost negligible.[30] Perhaps the best explanation of Rome's small part in seventh-century continental missionary history lies in the confusion that characterized that effort, a confusion arising from the numerous agencies trying to convert pagans and from the variety of methods these agencies employed. A brief glance at the continental situation must precede an evaluation of Rome's limited activity.

The Merovingian rulers were active in missionary affairs, seeking to push the cause of Christianity into semi-pagan and pagan principalities as a means of incorporating those principalities into the Frankish sphere of influence. Their means of achieving this end were varied. Frankish conquest usually resulted in the establishment of a pro-Christian ruling dynasty in pagan territories, as might be illustrated by the history of the Thuringians and the Bavarians.[31] These dynasties were expected to Christianize their subjects and usually made an effort to do so. The Frankish bishops, usually tools of the Merovingian kings, and always desirous of enlarging their sees, pushed their influences into pagan areas. For instance, Dagobert made important grants of land around Utrecht to Cunibert of Cologne, on the condition that the bishop convert the pagans in the area.[32] The eastern bishoprics in Francia also exercised powerful influences in southern Frisia, Alemannia, and Thuringia, probably again with royal support.[33] The Merovingian rulers even tried on occasion to send missionaries into these principalities in an attempt to speed up the process of Christianization and thus enhance the prospects of Frankish overlordship. Columban's personal activity as a missionary in Alemannia was certainly encouraged, if not actually ordered, by Theudebert.[34] Amandus began his missionary career in the border area between the Frisians and the Franks under the direct auspices of the Merovingians. Clothair was instrumental in his elevation to the episcopal rank without a see, a step that immediately preceded his missionary activities around Ghent. Dagobert complied with Amandus' desire for a decree that made baptism compulsory in the same area. After a series of other activities Amandus returned to missionary work in this general area, this time as bishop of Maastricht, an office that he must surely have received with the blessing of the Merovingian ruler.[35]

Another force adding to the missionary confusion on the continent in the seventh century was the activity of the Irish *peregrini.* The seventh century witnessed a steady stream of these wanderers coming to the continent. Not all of them turned to missionary work. However, some of them journeyed to the Christian frontier, founded their cells, and in the Irish fashion began to care for the religious life of the population in the vicinity, including the task of converting those who were still pagan. Fridolin, for instance, seems to have followed this line of activity in Alemannia.[36] Kilian came from Ireland to settle eventually in the area around Würzburg, where he found a supporter in the local prince and carried on missionary work until he was murdered, allegedly at the instigation of the prince's wife.[37] There were numerous others like them who worked in Thuringia, Bavaria, and Alemannia in the seventh century without leaving their names behind them.[38] Usually the achievement of these Irishmen was nebulous. While each was alive his own personality, his zeal, his asceticism won many followers in the locality where he labored. But his death usually marked the end of his influence. He provided no permanent establishment to continue what had been begun. Many who accepted Christianity under the guidance of the Irish reverted to paganism after the departure of the missionary; at least Boniface, who later worked over much of the area where the Irish had been most active as missionaries, often found such to be the case. For all its zeal, the Irish missionary venture on the continent tended to add to the general religious confusion.

---

[30] The best account of the expansion of Christianity during this period is Albert Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* I (3rd and 4th ed., Leipzig, 1904-1920), pp. 320-389. One might add an almost infinite number of studies of the penetration of Christianity into local areas; for a sample of such valuable studies see Dahlmann-Waitz, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte* (9th ed., Leipzig, 1931), #5190-5209.

[31] Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte* I, 367-371, 385-388; E. de Moreau, "Les missions médiévales" in Baron Descamps, *Histoire générale comparéé des missions* (Paris, 1932), pp. 185-186; Sigmund Riezler, *Geschichte Baierns* (2nd ed.), in *Allgemeine Staatengeschichte*, hrsg. Herman Oncken, 1. Abt.: *Geschichte der europäischen Staaten* XX (Stuttgart and Gotha, 1927), I^{1}, pp. 169-172.

[32] Boniface, *Ep.* #109; ed. Tangl, pp. 235-236.

[33] Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte* I, 322-328, 332, 338, 385-386; for examples of the operations of such bishops see *Vita Hugberti episcopi Traiectensis;* ed. W. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. VI, 482-496; *Vitae Landiberti episcopi Traiectensis;* ed. B. Krusch, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. VI, 353-429.

[34] Jonas, *Vitae Columbani abbatis discipulorumque eius Libri Duo* I, 27; ed. Bruno Krusch, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. IV, 101-104.

[35] *Vita Amandi episcopi I,* 13-18; ed. B. Krusch, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. V, 436-443.

The Irish monks were joined in missionary work by continental monks, whose efforts were often as futile as those of the Irish. Amandus[39] and Eligius,[40] both of whom carried on missionary work among the southern Frisians, are typical examples of continental monks who were moved by missionary zeal. The Irish monasteries at Luxeuil and St. Gall produced several monks who spent part of their careers in missionary work, especially in the semi-pagan areas of Bavaria and Alemannia; among these were Gall, Ailus, Eustasius, and Agrestius.[41] Bavaria seemed especially attractive to continental monks searching for souls to win; Rupert, Emmeran, and Corbinian[42] all seem to have labored there around 700 and to have found numerous pagans to convert. Although the careers of nearly all of these monastic missionaries are clouded with legend and difficult to reconstruct, it is clear that their efforts were haphazard and disorganized. Some of them acquired the position of wandering bishops, traveling over wide areas with a brief pause at any spot that struck their fancies. Others founded cells in the midst of some island of paganism. Some found a place to work by winning the attention of a local prince. The results of their labors, however conducted, were extremely impermanent and contributed to a great deal of confusion in the religious situation along the Frankish border.

This many faceted missionary effort on the continent created a limited opportunity for papal missionary activity. The major missionary agencies mentioned above were not accustomed to seek the aid of the papacy for any purpose. The Frankish royal house pursued an ecclesiastical policy that relied on Rome for nothing; there was no reason for the Merovingian kings to ask the papacy for assistance in missionary affairs. The Irish monks were not only extremely individualistic but also were at odds with Rome on several matters that touched very close to the missionary scene—principles of church organization, ritual, etc. They were not likely to turn to Rome for advice. Perhaps Rome was cool toward aiding them; for example, the famous Columban complained to Pope Sabinian (604-606) that he had written several letters to Gregory I without receiving an answer.[43] Even the continental monastic establishments usually had only few contacts with Rome. The Frankish episcopate of the seventh century, and especially the dioceses along the pagan frontier, were seldom in communication with Rome. Only by a bold policy of sending Roman missionaries into these areas could the papacy have become involved in view of the lack of communications with the agencies already doing the work.

---

[36] Baltherus, *Vita Fridolini confessoris Seckingensis;* ed. B. Krusch, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. III, 350-369.

[37] *Passio Kiliani martyris Wirziburgensis;* ed. W. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. V, 722-728.

[38] Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte* I, 371, ff. Louis Gougaud, *Christianity in Celtic Lands* (London, 1932), pp. 129-184.

[39] *Vita Amandi episcopi I;* ed. Krusch, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. V, 428-449; see also Edouard de Moreau, *Saint Amand, apôtre de la Belgique et du Nord de la France* (Louvain, 1927).

[40] *Vita Eligii episcopi Noviomagensis* II; ed. B. Krusch, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. IV, 634-742.

[41] Jonas, *Vita Columbani* II, 8-9; ed. Krusch, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. IV, 121-124; Wettinis, *Vita Galli*, 6; ed. B. Krusch, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. IV, 260.

[42] *Vita Hrodberti episcopi Salisburgensis;* ed. W. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. VI, 140-162; Arbeo, *Vita vel passio Haimhrammi episcopi et martyris Ratisbonensis* in *Arbeonis episcopi Frisingensis vitae sanctorum Haimhrammi et Corbiniani;* ed. Bruno Krusch, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol. (Hanover, 1920), 1-99; Arbeo, *Vita Corbiniani episcopi Baiuvariorum* in *ibid.*, 100-234. See also *De Conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum libellus*, 1-3; ed. W. Wattenbach, MGH, SS. XI, 4-7.

Since those actively engaged in missionary ventures did not rely on Rome's assistance and since the papal policy of the seventh century found bold action impossible, Rome's participation in continental missionary work during the seventh century was incidental and of little importance. Many of the missionary personalities of the era, including Amandus, Corbinian, and Kilian, were in Rome at one time or another.[44] These excursions were probably inspired by a desire to visit the tombs of the apostles rather than by an interest in gaining missionary assistance from the contemporary occupant of the holy see. However, Amandus is reported to have received his inspiration to do missionary work while he was in Rome and to have gained papal blessing for his work.[45] The biography of Kilian says that this Irish wanderer was received in Rome by Pope Conon (686-687), consecrated a bishop at the instigation of the pope, and sent to Thuringia to preach the gospel.[46] This biography is so late and the story told of Kilian is so similar to Boniface's career that one cannot accept it as proof of any such papal action. Amandus apparently did depend upon the papacy for advice in his missionary work. A letter addressed to him by Pope Martin I (649-654) reveals that, while serving as bishop of Maastricht, he wrote to Rome complaining of the poor quality of his clergy and of his inability to wipe out paganism as a result; his situation was so difficult that he desired to abdicate his see. Martin wrote back to dissuade him from any such move. The pope sent Amandus some acts of church councils, a recent papal directive, and relics, all intended to aid in missionary activity.[47] Perhaps the papacy also influenced some of the continental missionaries indirectly. For instance, Columban asked Gregory I for a copy of his *Pastoral Rule* and other writings.[48] Beyond these few cases, none of decisive importance, the Christian frontier advanced northward and eastward during the seventh century without Rome's assistance.

Perhaps the papacy gave at least a thought to missionary work among the Slavs during the seventh century. John IV (640-642), a native Dalmatian, sent an abbot named Martin into Dalmatia and Istria to purchase captives from the pagans.[49] A much later Greek source suggests that his venture had a missionary purpose. The Croatian prince at the moment appealed to the Emperor Heraclius for Christian teachers. Heraclius referred him to Rome. John obliged by sending a bishop and priest into the area. They baptized many, whereupon the papacy took the new converts under its special protection and sought to impose on them more Christian modes of conduct.[50] This account is extremely suspect, especially with respect to papal authority over the Croats at such an early date.[51]

---

[43] Columban, *Epistolae* #3; ed. Wilhelmus Gundlach, MGH, Ep. III, 164-165.

[44] *Vita Amandi episcopi I*, 6-7; ed. Krusch, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. V, 433-434; *Passio Kiliani*, 4-5; ed. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. V, 723-724; Arbeo, *Vita Corbiniani*, 6-9; ed. Krusch, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol., pp. 194-197.

[45] *Vita Amandi episcopi I*, 7; ed. Krusch, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. V, 434.

[46] *Passio Kiliani*, 5; ed. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. V, 724; see Levison's comments, *ibid.*, 714-715.

[47] This letter is included in *Vita Amandi episcopi II. auctore Milone;* ed. W. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. V, 452-456.

[48] Columban, *Ep.* #1; ed. Gundlach, MGH, Ep. III, 156-160.

[49] *Liber Pontificalis* I, ed. L. Duchesne (Paris, 1886-1892), p. 330.

[50] Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando imperio liber*, 32; PG 113, 288-292.

[51] For some of the difficulties connected with this account, see F. Dvornik, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IXe siècle*

However, one might well conclude that John instructed his envoy to try to win converts in an area that was rapidly losing its Christian characteristics. Certainly the venture was not successful; nearly two centuries were to pass before the Slavs of this area were converted.

III.

Before the seventh century ended, the papacy once again found the opportunity to participate in an important way in missionary activity and to end its isolation from the main areas of missionary work. Perhaps a harbinger of the new day was the pause in Frisia made by the Anglo-Saxon bishop Wilfrid on one of his trips to Rome. Detained by inclement weather and by certain political considerations, this persistent champion of Rome passed the winter of 678-679 preaching to the Frisians and converting many of them.[1] Certainly he must have recounted his experiences and revealed his enthusiasms over the prospects for a Frisian mission while in Rome. The new missionary movement was brought more forcibly to Rome's attention when in 692 another Anglo-Saxon, Willibrord, appeared in Rome "in order that he might go about his desired work of converting pagans with the licence and blessing of Sergius."[2] Both Wilfrid and Willibrord were pioneers in a new phase in the history of western European missions, the heralds of a stream of Anglo-Saxon monks and priests who came to the continent during the period from about 690 to 770 and who devoted their major efforts to missionary work on the northern and eastern fringes of the Frankish kingdom. Their arrival resulted in the confluence of several missionary forces and in a period of feverish missionary activity. One of these forces was the papacy, which acted promptly and with vigor in furthering the missionary activities of the Anglo-Saxons and, consequently, exerted an important influence on the missionary history of the period.

Conditions had changed considerably in Western Europe since the accession of Gregory the Great. As a result the papal role in this new missionary wave was bound to be different than it had been in his era. For one thing, the Anglo-Saxon monks were already inspired with a zeal for missionary work; the papacy no longer had to create such a zeal. The Anglo-Saxon zeal was perhaps derived chiefly from Irish influences. For instance, Egbert, who was responsible for arousing interest in a Frisian mission among some of his discriples, left England for Ireland in order to gain greater grace; it was while in Ireland that he conceived his desire to migrate to the continent as a "soldier of Christ."[3] Wigbert, Willibrord, and the brothers Ewald, all early missionaries in Frisia, had spent several years in Ireland prior to the beginning of their missionary work.[4] However, the English monasteries, beginning to reach their full vigor by the end of the seventh century, likewise inspired an urgent missionary zeal in the hearts of their members. Proof of the missionary urge generated by English monasticism might be found in the early career of Boniface,[5] who left England for Frisia and Rome with a "pious purpose"[6] firmly in mind, or of Willehad, the Northumbrian monk who felt the urge to do missionary work so strongly that he appealed to his king for permission to work in Frisia.[7] Whatever the source of the zeal, England produced a troop of missionaries who for three-

---

(Paris, 1926), pp. 71-74.

[1] Eddius Stephanus, *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, 26; ed. Colgrave, p. 52.

[2] Bede, *Hist, eccl.* V, 11, p. 301: ut cum eius licentia et benedictione desideratum euangelizandi gentibus opus iniret.

[3] *Ibid.*, V, 9, pp. 296-298.

[4] *Ibid.*, V, 9-10, pp. 298-301; Alcuin, *Vita Willibrordi*, 4; ed. W. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. VII, 118-119.

[5] Willibald, *Vita Bonifatii*, 1-2, in *Vitae sancti Bonifatii archiepiscopi Moguntini;* ed. Wilhelmus Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol. (Hanover and Leipzig, 1905), 4-11, for the monastic influence on Boniface.

[6] At least this was the designation given by Pope Gregory II to Boniface's plans on his first trip to Rome; Boniface, *Ep.* #12; ed. Tangl, p. 17.

[7] *Vita sancti Willehadi*, 1; ed. Albertus Poncelet, *Acta Sanctorum*, Nov. III, 842-843.

quarters of a century worked to advance the Christian frontier without any great urging of the kind that Gregory the Great had to give to his missionaries before they were more than a few hundred miles from Rome.

Neither was it any longer necessary for the papacy to select the areas suitable for missionary work. The English monks had settled this question in their own minds. Repeatedly one finds references to a sympathetic feeling which the English harbored for their kinfolk on the continent. When Egbert received the urge to become a missionary, his thoughts were directed immediately to Germany, where there lived many nations—the Frisians, the Rugii, the Danes, the Huns, the Old Saxons, and the Bructeri—from whom the English had had their origins and who had not yet heard the word of God.[8] Boniface, adressing himself to the English nation in a plea for help in converting the Saxons, saw fit to remind the English that they and the Saxons "were of one blood and one bone."[9] Willehad was prompted to become a missionary chiefly because he had heard of the deplorable condition of the pagan Saxons and Frisians.[10] The English thus came to the continent with a definite area in mind in which to work.

Finally, the situation had changed between 590 and 690 in another significant way. Missionary work after 690 gained on an ever increasing scale the support of the rising Carolingian dynasty. This support became more and more decisive in missionary affairs, chiefly because the new family represented a unity of policy and a purposiveness of action that had been lacking among the Merovingians of the late sixth and seventh centuries. The Carolingian house was inspired to aid missionaries partly out of religious motives; the members of this dynasty felt a strong sense of responsibility as champions of Christianity and conceived of missionary work as an especially notable good work in the Christian cause. However, their support of missionary activity was chiefly based upon their awareness of the intimate connection between Frankish expansion and the conversion of conquered peoples. The destruction of paganism was accepted as the surest way to destroy resistance to the Franks. The emergence of this new dynasty with its willingness to aid missionary work meant that any missionary effort in the eighth century could rely upon the patronage of the Carolingians, a lay patronage more powerful than had hitherto been lent to missionary ventures. The activity of the Carolingian patrons removed a part of the missionary burden from the papacy, thus seeming to decrease the papal role. This should not lead one to conclude that there emerged a rivalry between popes and Carolingians for control and direction of eighth-century missionary work. The papacy fully approved and encouraged Carolingian support of missionary work. The rising need that the papacy and the Carolingian house felt for one another's good offices brought these two agencies ever closer together in missionary policies as well as in other areas of ecclesiastical policy.

Against this background of events, all coinciding to create a favorable atmosphere for missionary work, one can now proceed to describe the part the papacy played in what might be called the Anglo-Saxon phase of continental missionary history. The missionary zeal of the Anglo-Saxons, coupled with the expansionist aims of the Carolingian mayors of the palace, resulted in a two-pronged missionary thrust. One was in the direction of Frisia. The other was eastward from the Frankish kingdom into Hesse, Thuringia, and Bavaria. The papacy played a role in each of these, although one of much greater magnitude in the venture east of the Rhine than in Frisia.

The Frisian mission was begun without papal participation.[11] English monks had apparently singled out Frisia as a likely place to work. Wilfrid was perhaps responsible for this decision. His accidental delay in Frisia in 678-679 revealed that King Aldgisl was willing to tolerate missionaries.[12] Although Wilfrid had more pressing problems to deal with than the conversion of the Frisians, he perhaps carried the word back to Northumbria that an opportunity existed in Frisia. Egbert, another Northumbrian living in Ireland, also contemplated a Frisian mission. He was responsible for sending Wigbert to Frisia about a decade after Wilfrid's short stay. Wigbert encountered the hostility of the new ruler Radbod and was forced to return to Ireland after two years.[13] Still another Northumbrian, Willibrord, a pupil of both Egbert and Wilfrid, next came to Frisia in 690. He found conditions more suitable due to a defeat inflicted on Radbod by Pepin of Heristal, a defeat that resulted in Frankish annexation of territory in south Frisia. Willibrord turned to Pepin's court immediately upon his arrival in Frisia; there he found a willing patron.[14] Thus the conversion of the Frisians opened as a joint venture of English monks and Carolingian rulers and remained so over most of its history.

---

[8] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* V, 9, p. 296.

[9] Boniface, *Ep.* #46; ed. Tangl, p. 75: Miseremini illorum, quia et ipsi solent dicere: 'De uno sanguine et de uno osse sumus. . . . '

[10] *Vita Willehadi*, 1; ed. Poncelet, *Acta Sanctorum*, Nov. III, 842-843.

[11] For descriptions of the Frisian missionaries see Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte* I, 431-437; II, 354-370; Josef Jung-Diefenbach,

The papacy, however, was not excluded. Shortly after his arrival in Frisia and after his arrangement with Pepin, Willibrord made a trip to Rome.[15] He sought to gain the permission and the blessing of Pope Sergius (687-701) for the Frisian venture. He also wanted to acquire relics for use in the new churches he contemplated building as paganism was wiped out. And "he desired to learn there or receive thence many other things that so great a work required."[16] This journey to Rome, which certainly must have been made with the approval of Pepin, clearly demonstrates the conviction on the part of the Christian world that papal recognition of a mission had a bearing on its success. Willibrord himself must also have felt that Sergius could give him advice on the task of converting the pagans of Frisia.

The Frisian mission was not yet finished with Rome after Willibrord's first trip there. "After they who had come over to Frisia had taught there a few years, Pepin, with the consent of all, sent the venerable Willibrord to Rome, where Sergius was still pope, requesting that he be ordained archbishop of the Frisian people. What was requested was done in the year of the Lord 696 . . . And he was sent back to his episcopal see fourteen days after he came to Rome."[17] Bede's account makes Pepin responsible for this important step. Perhaps such was the case. Pepin may have felt that he could allay Frisian hostility to Frankish domination by encouraging a church organization dependent upon Rome rather than upon the hated Franks. However, the decision to create a province of this order was certainly a departure from previous Frankish ecclesiastical policy. The suppression of the archiepiscopal see at Utrecht by Charles Martel after Willibrord's death also makes one suspicious of Bede's

---

Die Friesenbekehrung bis zum Martertode des hl. Bonifatius (Post Mödling bei Wien, 1931); Gabriel H. Verbist, *Saint Willibrord. Apôtre des Pays-Bas et fondateur d'Echternach* (Louvain, 1939); Alexander Grieve, *Willibrordi by Alcuin of York 691-739. Including a translation of the Vita Willibrordi by Alcuin of York* (Westminster, 1932).

[12] Eddius Stephanus, *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, 26; ed. Colgrave, p. 52.

[13] For Egbert and Wicbert see Bede, *Hist. eccl.* V, 9, pp. 296-298.

[14] *Ibid.*, V, 10, p. 299; Alcuin, *Vita Willibrordi*, 5; ed. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. VII, 120-121.

[15] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* V, 11, p. 301.

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 301-302: Sed et alia perplura, quae tanti operis negotium quaerebat, uel ibi discere uel inde accipere cupiebat.

[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 302-303: Postquam uero per annos aliquot in Fresia, qui aduenerant, docuerunt, misit Pippin fauente omnium consensu uirum uenerabilem Uilbrordum Romam, cuius adhuc pontificatum Sergius habebat, postulans, ut eidem Fresonum genti archiepiscopus ordinaretur. Quod ita, ut petierat, impletum est, anno ab incarnatione Domini DCXCVI . . . ac mox remissus ad sedem episcopatus sui, id est post dies XIIII, ex quo in urbem uenerat. See also Alcuin, *Vita Willbrordi*, 6; ed. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Merov. VII, 121. Bede's date is wrong; see Wilhelm Levison, "Willibrordiana," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, XXXIII (1908), 528.

statement. At least it might be suggested that Willibrord's return to Rome to be made archbishop was the result of Sergius' instructions delivered during Willibrord's visit in Rome in 692. Thus the papal role in directing the Frisian mission along a certain line might have been larger than Bede has suggested.

Beyond this point one finds little evidence that the papacy played a part in the Frisian mission as long as Willibrord was archbishop (until 739). The archbishop enjoyed the support of Pepin and Charles Martel, both of whom granted property to support the mission and used their armies to protect and broaden its field of action. The Frisian mission depended heavily upon England for many of the things it might have gained from Rome, e.g., recruits and advice.[18] In spite of the obvious dependence on England and on the Carolingians, the Frisian mission probably still remained in contact with Rome and perhaps consulted it on important matters. Numerous Anglo-Saxon pilgrims undoubtedly passed through Frisia on their way to Rome. Wilfrid spent a winter in Utrecht in 704–705.[19] Boniface was in Frisia, working in close cooperation with Willibrord, for three years after his first trip to Rome in 719.[20] A certain Marchelm, a disciple of Willibrord, was in Rome in 738 while Boniface was there on his third Roman trip.[21] Any of these instances might have offered ample opportunity for consultation with the papacy about missionary problems, although no direct evidence to prove this point can be produced.

Only once more did the papacy take a direct part in the history of the conversion of Frisia, again in connection with the problem of organization. After Willibrord's death Utrecht ceased to be an archbishopric.[22] Boniface, with the assistance of Carlomann, sought to gain control of the see as one of his suffragans with the right to appoint and consecrate a bishop. His efforts were undoubtedly inspired by a desire to insure the continuation of missionary work. However, his claims conflicted with those of the archbishop of Cologne. Boniface called upon Rome to decide the case in his favor.[23] Whether the pope acted upon this request is not clear; Boniface seems to have won his point, but probably with the aid of the Carolingians rather than of the papacy. Hardly had Boniface gained control of the situation when he was martyred trying to win converts in northern Frisia. His passing threatened the continuation of missionary work in Frisia, since the Frankish bishops, almost devoid of missionary interests, were grasping for control over Frisia. Pepin the Short and Pope Stephen II (752-757) collaborated to insure the continuation of missionary activity in Frisia, irrespective of the fate of the episcopal see. The two commissioned Gregory, a long-time disciple of Boniface, abbot of the monastery of St. Martin at Utrecht and charged him with the direction of the existing missionary establishment. For about twenty years (until 775) Gregory of Utrecht continued to direct the slow, laborious progress of Christianity into central and northern Frisia, his authority resting primarily on royal and papal approval of his efforts as missionary abbot.[24]

The expansion of Christianity on the eastern frontier of the Frankish kingdom provided the papacy with a greater opportunity than did the Frisian mission.[25] This opportunity came to it as a result of Boniface, whose career in one way or another completely dominated the missionary effort involved in converting the remaining pagans in Hesse, Thuringia, Bavaria, and to some extent Frisia. Thus the papal participation in this phase of missionary history is primarily an account of Rome's connection with Boniface.

---

[18] For examples of this close contact see Bede, *Hist. eccl.* V, 11, p. 302; *Vita Willehadi*, 1; ed. Poncelet, *Acta Sanctorum*, Nov. III, 842-843; Liudger, *Vita Gregorii abbatis Traiectensis;* ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH, SS. XV, 66-79; Altfrid, *Vita Liudgeri* I, 9-13, in *Die "Vitae sancti Liudgeri";* ed. Wilhelm Diekamp, *Geschichtsquellen des Bistums Münster* IV (Münster, 1881), pp. 13-18.

[19] Bede, *Hist. eccl.* III, 13, p. 152.

[20] Willibald, *Vita Bonifatii*, 5; ed. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol., pp. 23-26.

[21] Altfrid, *Vita Liudgeri* I, 13; ed. Diekamp, p. 18, designates Marchelm thus: servum Dei de genere ortum Anglorum et a sancto episcopo Willibrordo a pueritia sancti instructum moribus. . . . Liudger, *Vita Gregorii*, 8; ed. Holder-Egger, MGH, SS. XV, 73, speaks of Marchelm being in Rome in 738.

[22] For the complicated question of the disposition of the bishopric of Utrecht after Willibrord's death see Jung-Diefenbach, *Die Friesenbekehrung*, pp. 107-118; Hermann Nottarp, *Die Bistumserrichtung in Deutschland im achten Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1920), pp. 17-27.

[23] Boniface, *Ep.* #109; ed. Tangl, pp. 234-236.

[24] Liudger, *Vita Gregorii*, 10; ed. Holder-Egger, MGH, SS. XV, 74-75.

The papacy cannot be credited with taking the initiative in this missionary venture in the sense that Gregory the Great took the initiative in opening the English mission. Not until the Anglo-Saxon missionaries offered their services to end paganism on the eastern frontier of Francia did Rome show any interest. When Boniface made his first trip to Rome, he presented the papacy with a unique problem for which there was no precedent in papal missionary experience. He came, not as the English missionaries in Gregory's day, asking for papal advice on how to conduct affairs in a mission started by the pope. Nor did he come as Willibrord had, seeking authority to do what had already begun and was likely to continue, whatever the papacy chose to do. Boniface came to Rome inspired with an urge to do missionary work but without any specific program of action in mind. His zeal was a product of the monastic atmosphere in which he had been nurtured in England. He was a monk struck with the idea of paying greater service to God than he could by remaining in England. He had first tried to exercise that zeal in Frisia, only to find the situation there impossible.[26] So he turned to Rome for further guidance. Besides being a monk zealous for missionary work, Boniface was also an Englishman willing to accept papal authority as the highest in Christendom and to serve the pope as an obedient servant. Rome therefore was a natural place to turn for religious guidance. In a letter written on May 15, 719, commissioning Boniface to do missionary work, Gregory II (715-731) stated with great clarity Boniface's manner of presenting himself: "Your pious purpose, as it has been declared to us, demands of us that we make use of you as our co-worker in spreading the divine words. Knowing . . . that you now wish, for the love of God, to extend the talent divinely entrusted to you, by dedicating yourself ceaselessly to missionary work and the teaching of the mystery of the faith among the heathen, carrying to them the saving knowledge of divine oracle, we rejoice in your loyalty and desire to further the work of grace vouchsafed to you."[27] In all likelihood Boniface had suggested a desire to convey Christianity to those Germanic peoples with whom the English felt a special kinship, an idea that was common in England at the time.[28] Moreover, he could, on the basis of his own experience, recommend the unlikelihood of missionary success in Frisia. This evidence hardly warrants a conclusion that Boniface had a definite plan in mind as to where he wanted to go or that he had come to Rome to secure approval for a specific missionary venture. He presented himself to Gregory as a missionary ready to serve the highest authority in Christendom in fulfilling a task of vital interest to all Christians, spreading the faith. Thus there was thrust upon the pope the need to make an important decision and the opportunity to once again make the papacy a significant missionary force.

---

[25] No attempt will be made in the following section to describe in detail the missionary work of Boniface. As guides for that activity the following might be recommended: Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte* I, pp. 448-594; Gustav Schnürer, *Die Bekehrung der Deutschen zum Christentum: Bonifatius* (Mainz, 1909); Godfrey Kurth, *Saint Boniface*, tr. from 4th French ed., Rt. Rev. Victor Day, with insertions . . . by Rev. Francis S. Betten (Milwaukee, 1935); Johann Joseph Laux, *Der heilige Bonifatius. Apostel der Deutschen* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1922); Theodor Schieffer, *Winfrid-Bonifatius und die christliche Grundlegung Europas* (Freiburg, 1954); Heinrich Böhmer, "Zur Geschichte des Bonifatius," *Zeitschrift für hessische Geschichte und Landeskunde*, L (n.f., XL) (1917), 171-215; Michael Tangl, "Bonifatiusfragen," *Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Jhrg. 1919 (Berlin, 1919); Michael Tangl, "Studien zur Neuausgabe der Bonifatius-Frage," *Neues Archiv*, XL (1916), 639-790; XLI (1917), 21-101.

[26] Willibald, *Vita Bonifatii*, 1-4; ed. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol., pp. 4-18, for Boniface's monastic career and its resultant missionary zeal.

[27] Boniface, *Ep.* #12; ed. Tangl, p. 17: Exigit manifestata nobis relegiosi propositi tui pie in Christo flagrantis intentio et adprobata sincerissima fidei tuae perlata relatio, ut ad dispensationem verbi divini, cuius per gratiam Dei curam gerimus, te conministro utamur. Experientes . . . te . . . indolem ad augmentum crediti caelitus talenti prospectu divini amoris extendere, videlicet gratiam cognitionis caelestis oraculi in laborem salutiferę praedicationis ad innotescendum gentibus incredulis mysterium fidei instanti conatu expendere: conlaetamur fidei tuae et adiutores effici cupimus gratiae praerogatę.

[28] See above, p. 69. Boniface was certainly aware of this feeling of kinship with the continental Germans; see Boniface, *Ep.*

According to Boniface's biographer, Gregory II took considerable time in deciding upon an answer to Boniface's request.[29] Eventually he acted by granting Boniface a papal commission entitling him to "go forth . . . to those peoples who are still in the bonds of infidelity . . . to teach the service of the kingdom of God . . ."[30] Gregory granted such a commission on the basis that missionary work was the "special care" of the papacy. He had satisfied himself that Boniface was qualified by learning and by zeal to serve as "co-worker in spreading the divine words,"[31] and that he was willing to obey the papacy "as a single member of a body submits itself to the sovereignty of the head."[32] Gregory further instructed Boniface to go as a teacher, persuading the pagans of the truth and pouring into their minds the knowledge of the Old and the New Testament in a manner suited to their understanding. Finally, Boniface was ordered to use "the sacramental discipline prescribed by the official ritual formulary of the Holy Apostolic See."[33] The letter which contained these ideas and instructions was placed in Boniface's hands, obviously as the authority for any action that he might take.

The concepts presented in this letter demonstrate a new stage in the papal role in missionary work. Any reading of Gregory the Great's connection with missionary work suggests that he acted in missionary affairs in order to give aid to those doing a work he would personally have preferred to do were he not pope. He conceived his role as that of a monk aiding other monks but not that of a pope exercising his papal function. His successors usually confined their support of missionaries to exercising powers already defined by canons, e.g., elevating bishops to the archiepiscopal rank, or to serving as spiritual fathers to Christians needing aid or encouragement, e.g., writing letters of encouragement or advice on specific problems. Gregory II advanced beyond these ideas. His letter defined the position of the papal office relative to all missionary activity. By virtue of his succession to St. Peter the pope had the duty to spread the faith. To fulfill that function he must discover workers, judge of their fitness, and commission them to go to their labors. He must instruct them whenever necessary in the techniques of missionary work. He must assume responsibility for guarding the results of their labors lest deviation from the true faith be instituted among the ignorant pagans. In short, Gregory's letter to Boniface stated the principle that proper missionary activity could only be conducted under papal direction, since the spreading of the faith was a definite function of the papal office. Those historians who interpret this letter as the first step in a preconceived plan to reform the Frankish church or as the opening wedge in a papal scheme to arrange an alliance with the Frankish state or as an attempt of the papacy to construct an ecclesiastical domain independent of the existing *Landeskirchen* are perhaps reading too much into its content. True, all of these developments emerged as a result of the events of 719. At the time Gregory

---

#46; ed. Tangl, pp. 74-75.

[29] Willibald, *Vita Bonifatii*, 5; ed. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol., p. 21.

[30] Boniface, *Ep.* #12; ed. Tangl, pp. 17-18: ideo . . . ad gentes quascumque infidelitatis error detentas properare . . . ministerium regni Dei . . . designes. . . .

[31] See above, note 27, for these passages.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 17: . . . ut membrum ex membro proprii corporis caput requirens. . . .

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 18: Disciplinam denique sacramenti . . . ex formula officiorum sanctae nostrae apostolicae sedis. . . .

II revealed absolutely nothing to show that such schemes were his intention. His commission to Boniface was only a definition of the papal role in missionary work, a definition that the pope was compelled to make because an English monk who wanted to serve God as a missionary and who was convinced that Rome was the highest authority in Christendom presented himself to the pope and asked to be put to work.

The papal assumption of the obligation of missionary work plus the willingness of Boniface to live within its implications resulted in a flurry of papal activity in the ensuing years. The connection of Gregory II, Gregory III (731-741), Zacharias (741-752), and Stephen II to the missionary events of the times allows them to be recorded as great missionary popes, making a notable contribution to the expansion of Christendom along the eastern borders of the Frankish kingdom.

Gregory II was especially important in the successful outcome of Boniface's work. Boniface left Rome in 719 with no definite program of action, his papal commission making no specific references as to where he was to work. His first task as co-worker of the pope was to discover an area where actual missionary work might have a chance of success. During the next three years he traveled through Bavaria, Thuringia, Frisia, and Hesse, seeking such a spot. He finally found the proper scene in Hesse and there began to win a considerable number of converts.[34] Of equal importance was the fact that he as a missionary began to draw others into his orbit to help in his work. His correspondence reveals that the news of the work he had undertaken had reached England and that the English were already offering their assistance,[35] a development that was of vital importance to his success. Boniface began to establish connections in Francia that also were significant, since he was laboring in territory that was under Frankish lordship.[36] He was also beginning to recruit a body of missionaries for his work.[37] These developments, coupled with the actual success of Boniface in winning converts in Hesse, spelled a fulfillment of the missionary venture conceived in Rome in 719. True to his position as decided upon in Rome, Boniface once again turned to the papacy, sending a letter to Gregory II reporting his success and requesting advice on the problems connected with his daily work as a missionary. Gregory II replied by summoning Boniface to Rome in 722,[38] obviously exercising his recently claimed authority as the director of missionary effort.

The transactions in Rome in 722 represented a further clarification of the papal part in missionary work as well as a major contribution of the papacy to Boniface's success. Gregory II again took care to ascertain Boniface's fitness to conduct missionary work, fitness being defined in terms of knowledge and acceptance of the apostolic tradition and of a willingness to obey Rome. This careful scrutiny of missionary personnel demonstrates the seriousness with which the papacy took its position in missionary affairs and contrasts rather vividly with Gregory the Great's lack of concern with questions of orthodoxy. Willibald reports that after Gregory had ascertained Boniface's orthodoxy, he gave his missionary elaborate instructions. Perhaps the two discussed the whole procedure to be followed in the future with respect to missionary work. Being satisfied that Boniface was qualified for greater responsibility, Gregory II vested him with episcopal authority in order that he could perform his missionary work more adequately.[39] Boniface's elevation was sealed by an oath which the missionary himself wrote, placing himself under papal authority and binding himself to work and teach only as Rome prescribed.[40] Boniface was the first missionary who had received his consecration as a missionary bishop from the pope himself; previously it had been thought sufficient if a missionary clergyman received this rank from anyone canonically qualified to consecrate bishops. This unusual procedure in 722, for which Gregory had obviously called Boniface to Rome, again demonstrates the new vigor of papal overlordship of missionary work and the new feeling that the papacy was now exercising an official function comparable to filling an episcopal office in the Roman province, that is, a function which belonged to the papacy by right. Whereas previously the elevation of a missionary to the episcopate had been a matter of expediency, it now had become a step in the papal method of exercising its rightful power.

---

[34] The essential source for Boniface's activity after leaving Rome in 719 is Willibald, *Vita Bonifatii*, 5-6; ed. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol., pp. 22-27.

[35] Boniface, *Ep.* #13-15; ed. Tangl, pp. 18-28.

[36] Willibald, *Vita Bonifatii*, 5; ed. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol., p. 23; Luidger, *Vita Gregorii*, 2-3; ed. Holder-Egger, MGH, SS. XV, 67-70.

[37] Liudger, *Vita Gregorii*, 2; ed. Holder-Egger, MGH, SS. XV, 67-69.

[38] Willibald, *Vita Bonifatii*, 6; ed. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol., p. 27.

Once having made Boniface a missionary bishop, Gregory took further steps to aid his labors. He presented Boniface with a series of constitutions and canonical collections that were to serve as guides in future missionary work.[41] He also provided Boniface with a series of letters designed to permit the new bishop to exercise his new power more readily. These letters show that the papacy had helped Boniface to decide the area that was to be proselytized next, that is, Thuringia, and was ready to lend its authority to help Boniface receive a hearing in Thuringia. The first[42] was addressed to the Christians living in Thuringia. They were informed that Boniface was being sent to convert pagans and to correct fallen-away Christians. They were exhorted to lend every possible aid to the bishop, including guides for his journeys and food. Their reward for any help they gave would be "fellowship with the saints and martyrs of Jesus Christ . . ." Any hindrance would result in eternal damnation. The second letter[43] especially commended Boniface to five Thuringian nobles who had resisted falling into paganism and thus were especially likely to aid the missionary bishop. These nobles were asked to obey and aid Boniface. Apparently Boniface knew from his own experience in Hesse prior to his coming to Rome how important the aid of local nobles could be;[44] thus the papacy took special steps to encourage such assistance. A third letter[45] was a conventional notification of Boniface's elevation to the episcopate addressed to all laymen and clergy in Thuringia. Apparently this document was designed to insure Boniface's acceptance as a bishop. The fourth letter[46] was addressed to Charles Martel. The letter informed him of Boniface's consecration and of his papal commission to convert the pagans "on the eastern side of the Rhine." Gregory II wrote as follows: "For their sakes we warmly commend him to your high favor and pray you to help him in every need, to defend him against every enemy over whom you may prevail in the Lord's name, bearing in mind that whatever support you solicitously give to him will be given to God, who said that those who received his holy apostles, sent forth as a light to the Gentiles, would be receiving Himself."[47] Lay assistance and recognition was thought to be vital to missionary success; Gregory II as the spiritual head of the mission was asking Charles to fulfill his religious duty by lending his aid. Moreover, there is implicit in the letter the request for the mayor of the palace to recognize the authority of the papacy to undertake missionary work and to take the steps necessary for its completion.

---

[39] *Ibid.*, 6, pp. 28-30 for these transactions.

[40] Boniface, *Ep.* #16; ed. Tangl, pp. 28-29.

[41] Willibald, *Vita Bonifatii*, 6; ed. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol., pp. 29-30.

[42] Boniface, *Ep.* #17; ed. Tangl, pp. 29-31.

[43] *Ibid.*, #19, p. 33.

[44] For instance, two Hessian nobles had provided him with the land upon which his missionary monastery at Amöneberg was built; see Willibald, *Vita Bonifatti*, 6; ed. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol., p. 26.

[45] Boniface, *Ep.* #18; ed. Tangl, pp. 31-33.

[46] *Ibid.*, #20, pp. 33-34.

[47] *Ibid.*, p .34: Pro quibus eum gloriosae benivolentiae tuae omnimodo commendamus, ut eum in omnibus necessitatibus adiuvetis et contra quosibet adversarios, quibus in Domino prevaletis, instantissime defendatis certissime retinentes Deo vos exhibere, quaecunque huic promptissimo impenderitis favore, qui sanctis apostolis suis ad lucem gentium destinatis suscipientibus eos se suscipiendum predixit.

The whole course of papal action in 722 indicates that Gregory II and Boniface together had conceived a comprehensive missionary plan. Boniface, properly tested, instructed, and fortified with the necessary offices, was entrusted fully to win converts and instruct them in the new faith. To succeed he would need the assistance of the whole Christian society. The pope threw his prestige and authority behind mustering that assistance, supplying his missionary with letters instructing all people in their obligations and promising anyone who aided a share in eternal salvation, the keys to which Rome possessed.

Armed with his new authority and fortified with the moral prestige of Rome, Boniface returned to Germany. He labored in Hesse and Thuringia during the rest of Gregory's pontificate, aided by agencies other than the papacy, including especially Charles Martel, the laity in the region in which he was working, and the English. Gregory II entered the scene again only as Boniface asked for his aid. On December 4, 724, the pope replied[48] to a letter from Boniface in which the latter had reported his success and had requested papal aid in certain matters. Boniface reported that the bishop of Mainz was intruding into his area of operation and interfering with his work. Gregory wrote to Charles Martel, asking him to curb the bishop. Boniface also requested another papal letter to the Thuringians and other Germans. Gregory assured him that he would write such a letter. This he did in December, 724,[49] again reminding the Thuringians that in fulfillment of his apostolic function he had sent Boniface to preach to them, to baptize them, and to show them the way to salvation. He explicitly laid before them their duty: "But be obedient to him in all things; honor him as your father; incline your hearts to his teachings. For we have sent him to you not for acquiring any temporal gain, but for the profit of your souls. Therefore, love God and receive baptism in His name because the Lord our God has prepared for those who love Him things which the eye of no man has seen and which has never entered the heart of man. Leave off evil deeds and do good. Do not worship idols or sacrifice flesh because God does not accept these things. Instead do what our brother Boniface directs and you and your sons will be saved. Make a house where your father and our bishop may live, and churches where you might pray, so that God will forgive your sins and give you eternal life."[50] The tenor of these remarks makes it clear that Boniface wanted this letter to be addressed to the real pagans in his missionary field and not to the Christians, as had been the case with previous papal letters. Papal admonitions were apparently useful in overcoming pagan opposition.

Sometime before November 22, 726, Boniface sent another letter to Rome requesting advice on a series of problems arising from his work with pagans. Gregory II answered on that date,[51] supplying specific information on the way to handle the troublesome situations and stating that Boniface had acted wisely in consulting Rome, since "the blessed apostle Peter stands as the fountainhead of the apostolate and the episcopate." The pope laid down regulations on such matters as marriage practices, the ritual, the problem of baptism in a situation where many had been irregularly baptized previously, clerical discipline, and the persistence of pagan practices. The pope's advice was generally in line with a rather strict conformance with regular canonical rules, although he advocated leniency in some cases. The whole letter indicates that Boniface found papal authority helpful in completing his work in Hesse and Thuringia, especially in matters pertaining to the institution of Christian practices among those recently converted.

---

[48] *Ibid.*, #24, pp. 41-43.

[49] *Ibid.*, #25, pp. 43-44.

[50] *Ibid.*, pp. 43-44: Sed vos ei in omnibus oboedite et sicut patrem vestrum illum honorate et ad eius doctrinam corda vestra inclinate, quia illum non pro lucro aliquo temporali conquirendo direximus, sed pro lucro animarum vestrarum ad vos eum misimus. Diligite ergo Deum et in nomine eius baptismum suscipite, quia dominus Deus noster, quod oculus hominis numquam vidit nec in cor hominis ascendit, praeparavit diligentibus se. Iam recedite a malis operibus et agite bene. Non adoretis idola nec immoletis carnes, quia Deus non recipit ista, sed in omnibus, secundum quod vos frater noster Bonifatius docuerit, observate et agite; et salvi eritis et vos et filii vestri in sempiternum. Facite ergo et domum, ubi debeat ipse pater vester episcopus habitare, et ecclesias, ubi orare debeatis, ut Deus indulgeat peccata vestra et donet vobis vitam perpetuam.

[51] *Ibid.*, #26, pp. 44-47.

The contribution which Gregory II had made to Boniface's work explains the missionary's concern when the pope died in 731. Boniface immediately sent a delegation to Rome bearing a letter[52] which requested that the new pope continue the existing arrangement. Boniface also reaffirmed his obedience to Rome and requested a renewal of the pact between pope and missionary. In the same letter Boniface reported his progress, spoke of his difficulty in controlling his far-flung theater of operations, and presented the new pope with a series of problems upon which advice was needed. Gregory III answered in 732 in a fashion that not only reassured Boniface that the papacy still supported him but also indicated that Rome was retaining its position as the director of missionary activity. He raised Boniface to the rank of archbishop and sent him the pallium. This step was not merely a reward to a faithful missionary; it was a part of missionary strategy. Recognizing that Boniface had been successful, the pope judged the time ripe for the completion of an ecclesiastical organization through the consecration of new bishops for Germany. Having given Boniface the authority for this next step, Gregory III left the matter of choosing the bishops and establishing the sees to the new archbishop. He thereby established a goal toward which Boniface could work. While issuing these important orders, Gregory III did not neglect to answer Boniface's immediate problems. After the fashion of Gregory II he ruled on a series of problems presented by Boniface. The most difficult problem with which Boniface had to deal was the persistence of certain pagan practices, such as eating horse meat, making sacrificial offerings for dead pagans, irregular baptisms performed by pagans, and selling slaves to other pagans for sacrifices. All of these practices were condemned. Boniface must have known that they would be, asking the papacy to rule on such matters only so that he could use papal authority as an argument against his new converts. Boniface also needed further advice on marriage regulations, the treatment of certain criminals, and the discipline of the clergy. On all of these matters Gregory supplied canonical regulations.[53]

For some years after his elevation in 732 Boniface went on with his work in Hesse and Thuringia, doing nothing to abide by the papal order to complete the organization of the church. In 735 he made an excursion to Bavaria, perhaps simply as a preacher desirous of correcting the abuses that existed there. He perhaps also contemplated opening a Saxon mission about this time. These projects, however, still left undone the task imposed on him in 732. Thus in 737 Boniface again departed for Rome, apparently to consult with the papacy on the matter.[54] Out of the consultations came an order from the papacy to undertake the complete organization of Bavaria, Alemannia, Hesse, and Thuringia. These decisions were announced in three letters written by Gregory III when Boniface left Rome. One of the letters was addrssed to the bishops, priests, and abbots of all lands, calling upon them to give Boniface their support as he returned to his work.[55] The pope especially requested that clergymen aid Boniface in gaining clerical recruits for his work. A second was sent to the nobles and people of Hesse and Thuringia, asking that they accept the priests and bishops Boniface annointed for them by virtue of apostolic authority.[56] A third was addressed to five bishops in Bavaria and Alemannia.[57] Boniface was announced as the papal representative and vicar, charged primarily with reforming the Bavarian and Alemannian churches according to Roman usage and with establishing a system of synods that would insure the continuance of sound discipline. A letter from Gregory III to Boniface about a year later[58] makes it clear that Boniface was ordered to constitute three new bishoprics in Bavaria, as well as recognizing one that already existed, to ferret out unfit clergy, and to hold a synod to institute a reform program. This program was apparently a revival of the abortive plan of Gregory II, instituted in 716 with the collaboration of the Bavarian princes.[59] Finally, Gregory III put into Boniface's hands a letter addressed to the Saxons, asking them to abandon their pagan religion and supplying them with reasons why they should become Christians.[60] These letters taken together again demonstrate the papal assumption of the authority to direct a missionary program to its conclusion and its willingness to buttress its missionaries with the proper authority to complete the work.

---

[52] Willibald, *Vita Bonifatii*, 6; ed. Levison, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol., pp. 34-35.

[53] Boniface, *Ep.* #28; ed. Tangl, pp. 49-52.

[54] There is no agreement on why Boniface took the third trip to Rome; see the authorities cited in note 25, above, for various opinions. Most of them agree that Boniface came to Rome for permission to do *something*, thus proving his reliance on Rome for all things.

[55] Boniface, *Ep.* #42; ed. Tangl, pp. 67-68.

Boniface carried out these instructions during the next few years.[61] He instituted four bishoprics in Bavaria, three in Hesse-Thuringia, and one in Nordgau. Sometime before October 29, 739, he reported to Rome on his work in Bavaria; Gregory III confirmed it in a letter written on that date.[62] Early in 742 Boniface wrote to the new pope, Zacharias, to reaffirm his obedience to Rome and to report the creation of bishoprics at Würzburg, Buraburg, and Erfurt. He requested that the pope confirm them with his charters.[63] Zacharias, after a considerable delay (until April 1, 743), wrote to Boniface approving the new bishoprics.[64] He indicated that his approval was not merely a formality by questioning the wisdom of building bishoprics in places so small. He also wrote letters to two of the new bishops, confirming each new see and forbidding any interference with them in the future. Likewise, he ruled that these new sees could only be filled with the approval of the representative of Rome.[65] A little later still another see was created at Eichstätt. An Englishman, Willibald, who had been sent into Germany with Boniface by Gregory III, was made bishop. Again the papacy confirmed the new see.[66]

The papacy had one more step in mind to conclude the development of the church in Germany—the creation of a metropolitan see for Boniface. For a long time this had not been desirable in the missionary district. As late as 739 Gregory III ordered Boniface to refrain from lingering in one place.[67] However, by 745 Boniface's work had progressed far enough to permit an end to his wanderings. A Frankish synod and the Frankish rulers chose Cologne as a metropolitan see for the missionary archbishop. Zacharias approved this act and sent a charter instituting Cologne as a metropolitan church.[68] However, this plan did not come to pass. In 748 Boniface reported to Rome that the Franks had not kept their word and that he was now residing at Mainz. He requested that the pope permit him to find a suitable successor, since he was growing old. Zacharias refused this request, insisting that Boniface remain in his office, still that of archbishop without a fixed see.[69] Boniface remained at Mainz until he departed for Frisia for his last missionary effort in 753. Mainz was not raised to the rank of a metropolitan see.

---

[56] *Ibid.*, #43, pp. 68-69.

[57] *Ibid.*, #44, pp. 70-71.

[58] *Ibid.*, #45, pp. 71-74.

[59] For Gregory II's instructions see *Lex Baiuwariorum*: Additio II; ed. Johannes Merkel, MGH, Leges III, 451-454.

[60] Boniface, *Ep.* #21; ed. Tangl, pp. 35-36.

[61] For a description of the erection of the bishoprics in Bavaria, Hesse, and Thuringia, see Nottarp, *Die Bistumserrichtung in Deutschland im achten Jahrhundert*, *passim.*

[62] Boniface, *Ep.* #45; ed. Tangl, pp. 71-74.

[63] *Ibid.*, #50, p. 81.

[64] *Ibid.*, #51, pp. 86-87.

[65] *Ibid.*, #52-53, pp. 92-95.

[66] *Vita Willibaldi episcopi Eichstetensis auctore sanctimoniali Heidenheimensi*, 5; ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH, SS. XV, 104-105.

[67] Boniface, *Ep.* #45; ed. Tangl, p. 73, where Gregory III wrote to Boniface: Nec enim habebis licentiam frater, percepti laboris in uno morari loco.

[68] *Ibid.*, #60, pp. 121-122, 124.

With the completion of the episcopal structure there perhaps remained no more real missionary work to be done in the areas where Boniface had labored so long. Boniface himself became involved in the reform of the Frankish church, thus eliminating any new missionary plans for a decade. However, in reading his correspondence one is aware that he never felt that his missionary work was finished in Hesse, Thuringia, and Bavaria. In 741 he requested the protection of Grifo for his establishment in Thuringia.[70] On other occasions he wrote to England telling of the great burdens facing him.[71] As late as 752 he asked Fulrad, abbot of St. Denis, to petition Pepin to make provisions for supporting his disciples working in Germany.[72] Sometime between 750 and 754 he wrote to Optatus, abbot of Monte Cassino, asking him to pray that the heathen be shown the light.[73] The source of Boniface's concern emerges clearly; in spite of having baptized most of the pagans, of creating a definite organization, and of establishing priests and monks over the land, there still remained the tremendous task of teaching the newly won Christians the real meaning of their religion and of compelling them to put it into practice. Thus he and his disciples labored on, trying to impose a more Christian life on his charges. In that task the papacy remained a faithful and valuable supporter of Boniface, supplying him with whatever advice he needed. And Boniface continued to follow his well-established custom of deferring to Rome. When Zacharias and Stephen II succeeded to the papal see, he wrote letters to each reaffirming his obedience and asking that friendly relations be maintained.[74]

For the most part Boniface's dependence on the papacy after about 741 consisted in securing papal authority to enforce canonical regulations and asking the papal opinion on how to handle situations arising out of the ancient customs of people who had not been Christian long enough to forget their pagan ideas and practices. For instance, the problem of rebaptism of those improperly baptized was presented to Rome on several occasions.[75] Questions concerning proper liturgical usage were also referred to Rome.[76] Boniface asked the papacy for a ruling on certain dietary practices which were holdovers from pagan times and received authority to prohibit them.[77] Marriage regulations caused trouble and demanded papal rulings.[78] Boniface was constantly faced with a shortage of adequate priests to labor in newly converted districts. In an attempt to solve this problem Boniface asked Pope Zacharias for permission to ordain priests before the accustomed age of thirty; the pope gave him permission to ordain men of twenty-five in view of the urgent need. He also sanctioned Boniface's custom of ordaining at irregular times, again because of missionary necessity.[79] Even more disturbing to Boniface was the ignorant, vice-ridden, corrupt clergy that he was forced to deal with and that often impeded his work. He repeatedly asked papal assistance against this element.[80] Many of these requests sprang from his reforming work in the whole Germanic world. Occasionally, however, these clergymen interrupted his work in recently converted or organized territories.[81] For instance, Zacharias gave Boniface authority in 744 and again in 748 to depose a false priest in Bavaria who claimed he had papal authority to hold one of the bishoprics established by Boniface in 739 and who was trying to cause friction between Boniface and Duke Odilo. In 748 Zacharias wrote to Theodo of Bavaria on the matter and also summoned the culprit to Rome.[82] Boniface knew he could depend upon the papal curia for canonical collections and any other documents he might need to strengthen his work.[83] Upon Boniface's request Zacharias granted a privilege to Boniface's new monastery at Fulda, so located that it could serve as a center for strengthening the faith among those whom Boniface had converted.[84] The papacy continued to encourage Boniface to keep at the heavy labor among the new Christians, assuring him that the reward would be in proportion to the labor spent.[85] This praise and honor may have been a great consolation and aid to the aging and sorely beset missionary. All these cases are eloquent proof that the papacy never ceased to lend its aid to Boniface's work and that Boniface always felt a need for papal guidance.

---

[69] *Ibid.*, #80, pp. 179-180.

[70] *Ibid.*, #48, pp. 77-78.

[71] *Ibid.*, #63, 65, 66, 67, 73, 74, 76, 78, 91, pp. 129-132, 137-138, 138-139, 139-140, 146-155, 155-156, 158-159, 161-170, 206-208.

[72] *Ibid.*, #93, pp. 212-214.

[73] *Ibid.*, #106, pp. 231-232.

[74] *Ibid.*, #50, 108, pp. 80-81, 233-234.

[75] *Ibid.*, #68, 80, pp. 141, 173-177.

[76] *Ibid.*, #87, pp. 192-201.

[77] *Ibid.*, #80, 87, pp. 172-180, 192-201.

[78] *Ibid.*, #50-51, pp. 80-92.

[79] *Ibid.*, #87, p. 198.

[80] *Ibid.*, #50, 60, 80, 87, pp. 80-86, 122-123, 172-180, 194-201.

[81] *Ibid.*, #63, pp. 132-136.

Boniface's death in 754 saw the main missionary work east of the Rhine completed. As subsequent events were to show, his passing proved a blow to papal missionary activity. The harmonious union of Rome and the Anglo-Saxon monk had worked out to make each a vital contributor in the expansion of Christendom. Again, as in the case of the conversion of England after Gregory I's death, the basis of papal missionary policy began to dissolve after Boniface's death. Between 690 and 754 each successive pope had counted on the presence of a pliant, obedient, inspired troop of Anglo-Saxon missionaries, willing to defer their problems to Rome and to accept Rome's overall guidance of their missionary work. The papacy constructed its missionary policy almost entirely on these missionaries. To such a group Rome could and did serve a vital function and thus earned due glory as a missionary agency. Her success, however, depended upon the continuation of these pliant Anglo-Saxon soldiers for Christ. Boniface's death heralded the passing of such a group, thus leaving Rome without the necessary support to continue her existing policy. Neither did Rome have the resources to adapt her policy to the rapidly shifting missionary picture. Again a definite age in papal missionary history had ended.

IV.

By the middle of the eighth century a profound change began to emerge in missionary affairs, negating the entire papal missionary policy of the moment. The rapidly rising Carolingian house was in the process of seizing the initiative in the expansion of Christendom and of subordinating all other missionary agencies to its leadership. The signs of this revolution in missionary affairs were clearly evident throughout the first half of the eighth century. However, it was only with the accession of Charlemagne in 768 that the Carolingians completed the process of assuming the responsibility for missionary work. For nearly a century thereafter Christian expansion was almost invariably organized and directed by the Frankish crown.

This new development resulted in a vigorous burst of missionary activity and several notable additions to Christendom. Charlemagne's efforts resulted in the conversion of the Saxons, the Frisians, and a large number of Slavs and Avars in the area of Pannonia and Carinthia. Louis the Pious, capitalizing on the desire of a faction of the embattled Danish royal house for a Frankish alliance, was responsible for sending Anskar to seek converts among the Danes. As a result of this foothold in the Scandinavian world, Anskar was also able to extend his activities to Sweden. Under the auspices of Louis the German Christian missionaries were able to advance into the Slavic world of central Europe, especially among the Czechs and Moravians. These successes establish the century after 768 as one of the most notable in the history of the expansion of Christianity.[1]

---

[82] *Ibid.*, #58, 80, pp. 107-108, 178-179.

[83] *Ibid.*, #54, 62, 75, pp. 96-97, 127-128, 156-158.

[84] *Ibid.*, #86, 87, 89, pp. 193-194, 196, 203-205.

[85] *Ibid.*, #57, 60, 80, 85, pp. 102-103, 120-121, 172-173, 179, 190-191.

The numerous accounts which record the achievement of the Carolingian kings and emperors as missionary leaders leave no doubt of their domination of every phase of missionary activity. Royal armies were employed in Frisia, Saxony, and the Avar empire to convince pagans of the advisability of accepting Christianity; so completely was missionary effort tied up with the Frankish military policy in Charlemagne's day that one can fully agree with the ninth-century author who said that Charlemagne "preached with an iron tongue."[2] Royal diplomacy consistently created missionary opportunities by holding out the prospect of a Frankish alliance to any pagan prince who would commit himself to the conversion of his people. The full authority of royal legislation was thrown into the battle against paganism. The Frankish crown assumed the responsibility for the recruitment of missionaries. The material support for missionary efforts was supplied by the rulers, especially through grants of land to the missionaries and through the imposition of tithes in territories recently incorporated into the Frankish state. The rulers took the initiative in organizing newly converted areas into an episcopal structure. Even the problem of missionary method was completely pre-empted by the Frankish crown. Almost nothing in missionary affairs escaped the attention of the Frankish rulers; they had indeed become the fountainhead of the missionary effort of the era.[3]

This ascendance of the Carolingian rulers obviously limited the role of the papacy in missionary affairs. The sources reveal conclusively that the papacy participated in the conversion of pagans only insignificantly from the pontificate of Paul I (757-767) through that of Benedict III (855-858), quite in contrast to the papal activity of the half century preceding Paul I. Even more striking is the revelation that on those occasions when the papacy did take part in missionary activity, it operated as an agency completely subservient to the Carolingian rulers, merely lending its support to policies established by them.

At the accession of Charlemagne there were only two active centers of missionary work. One was in Frisia, where monks operating from Utrecht continued to try to win converts in northern Frisia. Pope Stephen II had sanctioned the decision made in 755 to place one of Boniface's disciples, Gregory, in charge of the continued efforts to convert the pagans who had murdered Boniface. Until Gregory's death in 775 missionary work continued without any spectacular successes. The papacy played no role in this work. It remained primarily an effort carried on by Anglo-Saxons and by native Frisians, educated at Utrecht, supported by the material resources of the monastic establishment at Utrecht, and directed by the steady hand of Gregory.[4] The second missionary venture of the period centered on the southeastern border of Bavaria, where the episcopal see at Salzburg supplied missionaries and material support and the Bavarian princes lent political support in the effort to persuade Slavic groups to accept the new religion.[5] Pope Paul seems to have lent his authority to this venture by assigning the area being Christianized to the jurisdiction of Salzburg; however, in doing this he was only confirming a policy of his more vigorous predecessors, Zacharias and Stephen II.[6] Other than this the papacy had no interest in the conversion of the Slavs.

---

[1] For general accounts of missionary activity during this period, see Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte* II, *passim;* Latourette, *The Thousand Years of Uncertainty: A.D. 500-A.D. 1500*, pp. 98-119, 155-159; Amann, *L'époque carolingienne*, pp. 188-200, 247-255, 447-450; Hans von Schubert, *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche im Frühmittelalter. Ein Handbuch* (Tübingen, 1921), pp. 333-346, 502-514.

[2] *Translatio sancti Liborii*, 5; ed. G. Pertz, MGH, SS. IV, 151: . . . ferrea quodammodo lingua praedicavit.

[3] Any attempt to document these many cases of royal control of missionary activity for the century following the beginning of Charlemagne's rule would involve citing nearly the whole body of missionary literature from this period and will not be undertaken here. The general accounts cited in note 1, above, will supply examples.

[4] The chief sources for this activity are Liudger, *Vita Gregorii*, 10-15; ed. Holder-Egger, MGH, SS. XV, 74-79; Altfrid, *Vita Liudgeri* I, 1-20; ed. Diekamp, pp. 7-24; *Vita Lebuini antiqua;* ed. A. Hofmeister, MGH, SS. XXX², 789-795; Hucbald, *Vita Sancti Lebwini;* PL 132, 875-894; *Vita Willehadi*, 1-4; ed. Poncelet, *Acta Sanctorum*, Nov. III, 842-843.

In 772 Charlemagne led his first campaign against the Saxons and thereby began a new phase of missionary effort. For the rest of his career Charlemagne was almost constantly engaged in the conquest, conversion, and ecclesiastical organization of the Saxons and of their allies, the Frisians. The papacy played an extremely minor role in these stirring events, in spite of the fact that the final conversion of the Saxons and the Frisians involved several basic changes in missionary policy and caused considerable concern among some of Charlemagne's advisers.[7] Only once was the papacy consulted by Charlemagne on matters pertaining to the Saxon mission. Early in 786 Hadrian I (772-795) replied to a request made by Charlemagne about how to deal with Saxons who had once been Christians but had reverted to paganism. Hadrian, citing the examples of his predecessors, laid down the general principle that the circumstances under which apostasy occurred ought to govern the penance required for readmission to the ranks of the faithful. Otherwise, he shifted the burden to the clergy "in those parts."[8] One wonders why Charlemagne requested advice on this rather insignificant matter when he considers that by 786 Charlemagne had, without recourse to the papacy, laid down the major lines of his missionary policy in Saxony and Frisia. By that time he had employed forced baptisms, diplomacy, and bribery to win converts, had used his armies to destroy Saxon shrines, had charged already established bishoprics and monasteries in Francia with the responsibilities of converting the Saxons, had personally commissioned individual missionaries to work in Saxony, and had issued his *Capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae*. There is no evidence that Rome had any part in such decisions or any interest in their implications as missionary techniques. There was at least a tradition in later centuries that Hadrian I had lent his authority to the establishment of the bishoprics of Verden, Bremen, and Osnabruck.[9] However, that tradition was based on grounds so shaky that it does not permit one to attribute to Hadrian a part in the arduous task of organizing a Saxon church, a task which the Frankish rulers assumed to themselves.

Otherwise, Hadrian's role in the Saxon mission was confined to offering congratulations to Charlemagne. In 774 he wrote to the king expressing his joy at the latter's "immense victory" over the Saxons and informing Charlemagne that he had ordered the Roman clergy and monks to pray for further victories and for the king's prosperity.[10] Early in 786 Hadrian again wrote to Charlemagne to congratulate him on having converted the Saxons. Hadrian again reported to the king that he had ordered all those under papal jurisdiction to offer prayers for this great victory. However, this action was taken only at the specific request of Charlemagne. Repeatedly throughout the letter Hadrian gave the king full credit for converting the Saxons; nowhere did he suggest that the papacy was concerned with intervening in the procedure or had any suggestions to offer to the king.[11] On several other occasions Hadrian expressed a hope that Charlemagne would emerge victorious over "all barbarian peoples" and over "all adversaries of the church of God."[32] These messages, so often repeated that they seem to have become formulae, cannot be said to apply to any one of Charlemagne's numerous military ventures, and thus have no special missionary significance. Perhaps Hadrian served the Saxon mission indirectly by giving encouragement to the missionaries themselves. When Willehad was driven out of Saxony in 782 by a revolt, he traveled to Rome, where he voiced a fear that everything accomplished until then would be undone. But he soon returned to Francia, "not a little strengthened by the consolation of the venerable Pope Hadrian."[33] Hadrian is also credited with receiving Liudger with high honor when he was forced to flee from his missionary work and with giving him relics to be used in a monastery the missionary proposed to build.[34] It must be noted, however, that neither missionary returned to missionary work until ordered to do so by Charlemagne.[35]

---

[5] *De conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum libellus*, 2-5; ed. Wattenbach, MGH, SS. XI, 6-9.

[6] MGH, *Diplomatum karolinorum* I; ed. Engilbert Mühlbacher, 282-283.

[7] Aside from the works cited in note 1 above, the best study of the conversion of the Saxons is H. Wiedemann, *Die Sachsenbekehrung*, in *Veröffentlichungen des internationalen Instituts für missionswissenschaftliche Forschungen: Missionswissenschaftliche Studien*, ed. J. Schmidlin, neue Reihe, V (Münster i. W., 1932).

[8] *Codex Carolinus* #77; ed. Wilhelmus Gundlach, MGH, Ep. III, 609.

[9] See the falsified charters for Verden, Bremen, and Osnabruch in MGH, *Diplomatum karolinorum* I; ed. Mühlbacher, 333-338, 344-346, 399-402, 403-405.

[10] *Codex Carolinus* #50; ed. Gundlach, MGH, Ep. III, 569-570.

[11] *Ibid.*, #76, pp. 607-608.

Pope Leo III (795-816) added little to Hadrian's restrained policy. During his sojourn in Francia in 799 Leo participated in the creation of an episcopal see at Paderborn, dedicating the episcopal church and placing in it the relics of the martyr Stephen he had brought from Rome.[36] However, the papal contribution to the ecclesiastical organization of Saxony must not be overestimated from this one case. Leo's participation in the creation of the see at Paderborn was prompted merely by his presence in Saxony; certainly he had not made the trip from Rome for this purpose.[37] Charlemagne had already demonstrated that he had assumed the responsibility for the organization of Saxony by instituting a bishopric at Bremen in 785.[38] Perhaps there were also bishoprics at Minden and Verden by 799. In none of these cases was papal authority required by the Frankish rulers.[39] Even the account describing the proceedings at Paderborn in 799 make it perfectly clear that the new see was created by royal orders and that its institution did not depend upon papal authority. In the years after 799 Charlemagne proceeded toward the completion of the organization of Saxony without papal help, as could be illustrated by the creation of the see at Münster with Liudger as bishop.[40] Leo is also credited with aiding in the organization of the new Saxon church by dedicating certain chapels and churches during his trip in 799.[41] Again this was only prompted by his presence in Saxony and was not a matter of papal policy.

While Charlemagne was completing the conversion and the organization of the Saxons and the Frisians, his armies opened a new area for missionary work by destroying the political power of the Avars. Again the royal management of the missionary effort was complete. A synod held in 796, just prior to the opening of the decisive military campaign of that year, defined the procedures to be used in converting the Slavs and Avars about to be conquered.[42] The actual missionary work was assigned to the bishopric of Salzburg, then occupied by one of Charlemagne's chief lieutenants, Arn, and perhaps later to the sees at Aquileia and Passau.[23] Another royal adviser, Alcuin, offered Charlemagne and his court extensive advice on how to win converts among the Slavs and Avars without engendering the violent resistance that had accompanied the conversion of the Saxons.[24] In the struggle against the Avars Charlemagne did not even leave it to Rome to order prayers to celebrate the Christian victory; he took that responsibility himself.[25] Rome's only noteworthy contribution to the institution of Christianity in this new area was the elevation of Arn to the rank of archbishop and the granting to him of the pallium, thus permitting him to create bishoprics in the newly converted territories. Leo II's letters concerning this matter indicate that the initiative lay with Charlemagne and that the pope was merely enacting the will of the king.[26] Leo expressed the situation perfectly when, in a letter to Charlemagne announcing that he had made Arn an archbishop as the king ordered, he began as follows: "Since the holy catholic and apostolic Roman church, enriched in all good things, has been exalted through your laborious royal efforts, it is fitting that we fullfil in every way your legislative wishes."[27] Since the victory for the true faith was completely the work of the king, the least the pope could do was to accede to royal plans and lend his authority to their completion.

---

[32] For example, *ibid.*, #52, 53, 55, 61, 62, 66, 68, 72, 73, 75, 88, 89, pp. 573-574, 575-576, 578-580, 582-583, 589-590, 594, 597-598, 602-603, 604, 606-607, 624-625, 628.

[33] *Vita Willehadi*, 7; ed. Poncelet, *Acta Sanctorum*, Nov. III, 844.

[34] *Vita secunda s. Liudgeri* I, 13; ed. Diekamp, p. 60.

[35] *Vita Willehadi*, 8; ed. Poncelet, *Acta Sanctorum*, Nov. III, 845; Altfrid, *Vita Liudgeri* I, 22, ed. Diekamp, pp. 26-27.

[36] *Translatio sancti Liborii*, 4; ed. G. Pertz, MGH, SS. IV, 150.

[37] *Liber pontificalis* II, ed. Duchesne, 4-6; *Annales regni Francorum*, a. 799; ed. Fridericus Kurze, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol. (Hanover, 1895), pp. 106-107, for the occasion of Leo's journey to Charlemagne's court.

[38] *Vita Willehadi*, 8; ed. Poncelet, *Acta Sanctorum*, Nov. III, 845.

[39] This is assuming that the tradition reflected in the charters, cited in note 9 above, is false.

[40] Altfrid, *Vita Liudgeri* I, 23-24; ed. Diekamp, pp. 27-29. For the complicated question of the foundation of the Saxon bishoprics see Wiedemann, *Die Sachsenbekehrung*, pp. 67-95.

[41] Widukind, *Rerum gestarum Saxonicarum Libri Tres* II, 11; ed. Karolus Andreas Kehr, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol. (Hanover and Leipzig, 1904), p. 65. See also a spurious letter of Leo III in PL 102, 1028-1029.

[42] *Concilia aevi karolini* I, #20; ed. Albertus Werminghoff, MGH, Leges, Sectio III, Tomus II¹, 172-176.

If Charlemagne's missionary policy almost excluded the papacy, that of his successors made only slightly more room for Roman participation. The Scandinavian mission, initiated by Louis the Pious and continued by Louis the German, was no less a royal missionary venture than were the efforts that resulted in Charlemagne's conversion of the Saxons, Frisian. and Avars.[28] The only thing that was absent from ninth-century missionary activity in Denmark and Sweden was the Frankish army. Although every phase of the attempt to convert the Danes and the Swedes was instigated and controlled by the emperors, the ultimate progress of the mission required papal assistance. Both Louis the Pious and Louis the German called on Rome's services to implement their policies more frequently than did Charlemagne. Their actions identified the papacy more closely with missionary affairs than was the case in the last half of the eighth century, but left no more room for papal initiative.

Louis the Pious' first move to introduce Christianity into Denmark came in 822, when it was decided, probably at a diet at Frankfort,[29] to permit Ebo, archbishop of Rheims, to undertake a mission to Denmark. Before Ebo left for

---

[23] For the question of responsibility for converting the newly conquered Avars see *De conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum libellus*, 6; ed. Wattenbach, MGH, SS. XI, 9; Alcuin, Ep. #99, 107, 113; ed. Dümmler, MGH, Ep. IV, 143-144, 153-154, 163-166; MGH. *Diplomatum karolinorum* I, #211; ed. Mühlbacher, pp. 282-283.

[24] Besides his letters cited in the preceding note, see also Alcuin, *Ep.* #110, 111, 112; ed. Dümmler, MGH, Ep. IV, 157-163.

[25] *Epistolae variorum Carolo Magno regnante scriptae* #20; ed. Ernestus Dümmler, MGH, Ep. IV, 528-529.

[26] *Epistolae selectae pontificum Romanorum Carolo Magno et Ludowico Pio regnantibus scriptae* #3, 4, 5; ed. Karolus Hampe, MGH, Ep. V, 58-63; *De conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum libellus*, 8; ed. Wattenbach, MGH, SS. XI, 9-10.

[27] *Ep. sel. pont. Romanorum Carolo Magno et Ludowico Pio regnantibus scriptae* #4; ed. Hampe, MGH, Ep. V, 59: Dum per vestra laboriosa regalia certamina sancta catholica et apostolica Romana ecclesia de omnibus bonis ditata exultat, convenit nos in omnibus adimplere vestris legalibus votis.

[28] The essential sources revealing royal domination in the Scandinavian mission are *Ann. regni Franc.*, a. 823, 826; ed. Kurze, pp. 162-163, 169-170; Rimbert, *Vita Anskarii;* ed. G. Waitz, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol. (Hanover, 1884), pp. 5-79; Ermoldus Nigellus, *In honorem Hludowici . . . carmen* IV, vv. 1882-1993, 2164-2529; ed. and tr. Edmond Faral in *Les Classiques de l'histoire de France au moyen âge* (Paris, 1932), pp. 144-152, 166-192.

[29] *Ann. regni Franc.*, a. 822; ed. Kurze, p. 159, mentions that Danish legates were present at the diet of Frankfort in October, 822. A letter of Anskar (PL 128, 1031-1032) says: . . . Ebo Rhemensis archiepiscopus . . . temporibus domini Ludovici imperatoris, cum consensu ipsius ac pene totius regni ejus synodi congregatae, Romam adiit. . . . This would suggest that Ebo's trip to Rome resulted from the diet at Frankfort and that the decision to send him to Denmark was made at that time.

Denmark in 823, he was sent to Rome by Louis to secure papal authorization for his missionary work.[30] Pope Pascal I (817-824) acceded to the imperial request, giving to Ebo a letter,[31] addressed to all clergymen, princes, and the Christian faithful, in which the archbishop was granted full authority to preach to the pagans in "northern lands."[32] Pascal based his grant upon his responsibility as pope to care for the flock and spread the heavenly word, repeating to a large extent the ideas of Gregory II in his commission to Boniface in 719.[33] Ebo was constituted a papal legate armed with full authority to do whatever was necessary by way of preaching and teaching the pagans he encountered. Pascal commissioned Halitgarius, bishop of Cambrai, as a colleague of Ebo, in order that communications could be maintained between Ebo and Rome. He especially enjoined Ebo to refer any difficulties he encountered in fulfilling his office to Rome for advice and decision. As a further means of assisting the conversion of the north, Pascal ordered all Christians to aid the missionaries in every way possible and especially by supplying the needs of the journey. He promised eternal rewards to those who were helpful to the missionaries and excommunication for those who acted in such a way as to impede the work. Implicit throughout the letter is the assumption that the constitution of missionary ventures was a papal prerogative. Christian society must have placed some value on this aspect of papal authority; otherwise Louis would not have taken the trouble to send Ebo on a special journey to Rome. Perhaps Pascal had gone beyond Louis' request when he sought to make Ebo accountable to Rome for the conduct of the mission, since there is no evidence to suggest that the connection of Halitgarius to the mission was inspired by Louis. At least by implication Pascal was reasserting the policy of Gregory II toward missions and was again pressing the papacy into missionary affairs.

Ebo's mission was not a success[34] and he soon returned to Francia, apparently having no further relations with the papacy on the matter. Further political developments were necessary to encourage the Frankish crown to send another mission to Denmark. In 826 Harald, his family, and some of his followers were baptized under the sponsorship of Louis.[35] When Harald returned to Denmark, it was decided to send with him a priest who could serve as his chaplain and try to promote the spread of Christianity in Denmark. Louis and his advisers chose Anskar.[36] Again the papacy was called upon to lend its authority to this venture. Eugenius II (824-827), at the request of Ebo, commended Anskar and his associates to all the faithful.[37] Beyond this the new venture proceeded without papal aid. Anskar's efforts in Denmark were not encouraging, especially in view of the fact that Harald was forced to flee in 827.[38] Anskar next turned his efforts to Sweden, encouraged by the appearance of Swedish legates at the Frankish court in 829 bearing a report that their king would permit Christian missionaries in his land.[39] A two year stay in Sweden convinced Anskar that prospects were good for a major Christian victory. In 831 he returned to his chief benefactor, Louis the Pious, to urge the broadening of the northern mission.[40]

---

[30] *Ann. regni Franc.*, a. 823; ed. Kurze, p. 163, says that Ebo went to Denmark "consilio imperatoris et auctoritate Romani pontificis praedicandi gratia. . . ."

[31] *Ep. sel. pont. Romanorum Carolo Magno et Ludowico Pio regnantibus scriptae* #11; ed. Hampe, MGH, Ep. V, 69-71.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 69: partibus quilonis.

[33] See above, pp. 73-74.

[34] *Ann. regni Franc.*, a. 823; ed. Kurze, p. 163, and Ermolus Nigellus, *In honorem Hludowici . . . carmen* IV, vv. 2028-2061; ed. Faral, pp. 154-156, give Ebo credit for many converts. However, absolutely no other evidence can be found to suggest that Christianity had made any permanent footholds when Anskar went to Denmark in 826.

[35] For accounts of this event, see *Ann. regni Franc.*, a. 826; ed. Kurze, pp. 169-170; Ermoldus Nigellus, *In honorem Hludowici . . . carmen* IV, vv. 2164-2529; ed. Faral, pp. 166-192.

[36] Rimbert, *Vita Anskarii*, 7; ed. Waitz, pp. 26-29.

[37] See addition to a letter of Pascal in MGH, Ep. V, 70, note 4.

[38] For Anskar's first mission to Denmark, see Rimbert, *Vita Anskarii*, 8; ed. Waitz, p. 30.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

Louis immediately took steps to promote the conversion of the north. His new plan again required the services of the papacy. The emperor "burning with the ardor of the faith began to seek how he might be able to constitute an episcopal see in the northern parts, that is, on the frontiers of his empire; for thence it would be suitable for the bishop seated there to go more frequently into those parts in order to preach and thence all of the barbarian nations would be able to take the sacrament of divine mystery more easily and more fully."[41] The result was the creation of a new archbishopric at Hamburg and the elevation of Anskar to the new see. Although this whole action was taken by the imperial court, Rome's approval was sought, "so that all of this would retain the perpetual vigor of stability."[42] Anskar was sent to Rome along with imperial emissaries to request papal confirmation for the new see. Gregory IV (827-844) confirmed the new see. He granted Anskar the pallium, further strengthening the new archbishop's position. Gregory also made Anskar papal legate to the Danes, Swedes, Slavs, and all other people in the north, with full authority to evangelize, a position that Anskar was to share with Ebo, who already had such a commission from Pascal. Gregory threatened to punish those who interfered with Anskar. Especially important from a missionary viewpoint was a grant of authority to ordain new bishops.[43]

The remainder of Anskar's missionary career evolved around the attempt to Christianize the Danes and Swedes from an archiepiscopal center located within Frankish boundaries. Anskar and his associates enjoyed only minor successes until his death in 865. What little help Anskar did receive came from the Frankish crown, and especially Louis the German, who sought to reconstruct a base for missionary activity by joining the sees of Hamburg and Bremen after Hamburg had been destroyed by a Danish raid. The royal hand was not strong enough to command permanent respect in the north and thus Anskar usually had to rely on his own personal appeal in his attempt to win converts. The division of the empire in 840 deprived him of his property outside the kingdom of Louis the German and forced him to close his school in Hamburg.[44] Certainly the papacy did little to promote the work of its legate. Sergius II (844-847) apparently renewed in a bull of 846 the concessions of Gregory IV, reaffirming Anskar as archbishop of Hamburg, extending his authority over all converts won in the north, and granting him the use of the pallium. Along with that new concession went words of encouragement and especially the advice to construct new churches, ordain priests, and consecrate new bishops.[45] Perhaps this renewal was of significance at the moment, since Anskar had only recently been forced to flee from Hamburg before a Danish raid which had wiped out the fruits of his labor in that city. Leo IV (847-855) may also have confirmed Anskar's authority, although the only evidence for such action rests on a falsified bull of 849.[46] It was only with the pontificate of Nicholas I (858-867) that the papacy took a renewed and more positive interest in the Scandinavian mission. However, Nicholas' missionary policy in the north was a part of a new papal missionary program and must be left for a later treatment.

---

[40] For Anskar's work in Sweden between 829 and 831, see *ibid.*, 9-11, pp. 30-33.

[41] *Ibid.*, 12, p. 33: . . . ardore fidei succensus, quaerere coepit, quomodo in partibus aquilonis, in fine videlicet imperii sui, sedem constituere posset episcopalem, unde congruum esset episcopo ibi consistenti causa praedicationis illas frequentius adire partes, et unde etiam omnes illae barbarae nationes facilius uberiusque capere valerent divini mysterii sacramenta. For Louis' part in the creation of the new see, *ibid.*, 12, pp. 33-34, and *Ludowici Pii Praeceptum de missione S. Anskarii ejusque ordinatione;* PL 118, 1033-1036.

[42] Rimbert, *Vita Anskarii*, 13; ed. Waitz, p. 34: . . . ut haec omnia perpetuum suae stabilitatis retinerent vigorem. . . .

[43] For Gregory IV's grant, see *ibid.*, 13, p. 35; Gregory's letter of confirmation in PL 118, 1035-1036. The text of this letter is heavily interpolated.

[44] For Anskar's missionary work after he became archbishop of Hamburg, see Rimbert, *Vita Anskarii*, 15, ff.; ed. Waitz pp. 36 ff.

[45] PL 129, 997-1000.

[46] PL 129, 999.

While Anskar was attempting to extend Christianity into the Scandinavian world, missionaries were also pressing into the Slavic world on the eastern frontier of the Frankish empire. The effort was especially successful in Carinthia and Pannonia, where Charlemagne's armies had crushed Avar power in 796. The main missionary burden was borne by the bishops of Salzburg, Aquileia, and Passau. The Frankish rulers, and especially Louis the German, gave vital support to this effort by maintaining constant military pressure, encouraging colonization, furnishing liberal endowments to the missionary bishops, and supporting Christianized Slavic princes in the area.[47] Farther to the north Christianity gained some ground among the Czechs, Bohemians, and Moravians. Again it was a combination of Bavarian bishops and Frankish rulers that accounted for success. Progress was not rapid among these peoples and the Christian establishment always lacked stability because of the pronounced resistance offered by some Slavic rulers, apparently fearful that the new religion spelled German domination. However, by the middle of the ninth century some evidence suggests that many Slavs in this area had accepted Christianity. The Slavs along the lower course of the Elbe were hardly touched by missionary activity, even though this area was part of the missionary territory of Anskar.[48]

In all of the missionary activity among the Slavs the papacy took no part. There is not a trace of papal interest in the diplomacy and warfare involved in extending the Christian frontier, in the activities of the Bavarian bishoprics, or in the efforts of Christianized Slavic princes to convert their subjects. Probably the papal lack of concern offers further proof of the absence of a papal missionary policy throughout the last half of the eighth and first half of the ninth centuries. Unless the Frankish rulers needed assistance and requested or ordered papal compliance, the popes left missionary matters to other agencies. In the case of the missionary work among the Slavs nothing was needed from Rome. The conversion of these territories had not progressed far enough to require a special organization. The ambitious Bavarian bishops were eager to supply the personnel for missionary work and to retain any converts under their authority. Frankish diplomacy and military might, plus the interest of Slavic princes in currying Frankish favor, created sufficient opportunity for Christian expansion. Disciplinary questions and missionary procedural problems arising out of the Slavic missionary effort were settled at the Frankish court. Rome had nothing to add to this armory of missionary weapons and thus was excluded.

The failure of the papacy to continue after 750 the aggressive missionary policy it enacted before 750 perhaps needs no comment beyond the paucity of evidence of papal participation in the stirring missionary successes outlined above. However, the whole atmosphere surrounding the ferocious assault of the Carolingian princes on paganism suggests that the papacy contributed more to the course of missionary affairs than is revealed in the record of actual missionary events. Charlemagne himself gave the major clue to his missionary zeal in a letter to Leo III in 796. Writing to define his concept of the relationship between king and pope, he argued as follows: "This is our power: to defend by arms with the aid of divine piety the Holy Church of Christ everywhere from the incursions of pagans and from the devastations of infidels from without and to fortify the knowledge of the Catholic faith within."[49] Wars against the pagans and their subjugation were an important part of Charlemagne's theocratic concept of the role of the secular prince in Christian society.[50] He had a God-given duty "to defend the Church of Christ from the incursions of pagans and to propagate the faith."[51] Throughout the whole missionary picture of this era there existed an underlying assumption that the expansion of the Christian realm was a duty impinging on kingship, that every victory over the pagans was a testimonial of divine favor shining upon the Frankish rulers.[52] Royal missionary effort was a concomitant of Carolingian theocracy.

---

[47] The chief source describing the expansion of Christianity in this area from Charlemagne's death until the pontificate of Nicholas I is *De Conversione Bagaoriorum et Carantanorum libellus*, 9-14; ed. Wattenbach, MGH, SS. XI, 10-14, dealing with the activities of the archbishop of Salzburg. See also Hauck *Kirchengeschichte* II, pp. 711-715; Ernst Dümmler, *Geschichte des ostfränkischen Reiches* I (2 ed., Leipzig, 1887-1888), pp. 29-38; II, pp. 174-178.

[48] The information revealing the progress of Christianity among the Czechs, Bohemians, and Moravians is extremely limited and scattered through a variety of sources. For reviews, see Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte* II, pp. 716-718; Dümmler, *Geschichte des ostfränkischen Reiches* I, pp. 32-33, 285-286, 298-299, 345-346, 356, 388-390, 416-417, 426-427; II, pp. 21-25, 51, 178-179.

Leo III must have been pleased to read Charlemagne's letter. All the popes of the period must have, in the words of Hadrian I, "extended their palms to heaven, giving the highest praises to the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords, beseeching His divine and ineffable clemency that . . . He grant [the Frankish rulers] many victories over [their] enemies and bring all pagan nations under [their] heels,"[53] when they heard of the missionary successes of the Frankish kings. Throughout almost the whole eighth century the papacy had been beseeching the Frankish monarchs to assume the very attitude Charlemagne expressed above and to do what Hadrian was expressing thanks for, namely, to crush those who stood in the way of the Church. Even a sampling of papal thinking will illustrate how strongly the popes urged the Carolingians to assume a more positive role in caring for the Church. Repeatedly the papacy begged Pepin the Short, Carlomann, and Charlemagne to become defenders of the Church.[54] Pope after pope avowed that "God Almighty having predestined" the Frankish rulers "from their mothers' wombs, and blessed and annointed them as kings, constituted them defenders and liberators of His Holy Church."[55] The Franks were often referred to as God's chosen people, especially selected for the defence of Christendom.[56] God was on their side in their wars.[57] Their kings were the only refuge after God, left to the papacy and the Church as a whole,[58] standing as an "unconquerable wall"[59] against the evils of the day. Again and again the papacy called on the Frankish king to arise as a new Moses or David or Constantine to deliver the Church from its perils.[60] The papacy never ceased praying that the Franks would win tremendous victories over all pagan nations and that their boundaries would expand without hindrance.[61] Rome repeatedly gave guarantees that, since the pope held the keys to the eternal kingdom, the Frankish rulers were assured of salvation as long as they cared for the Church.

---

[49] Alcuin, *Ep.* #93; ed. Dümmler, MGH, Ep. IV, 137: Nostrum est: secundum auxilium divinae pietatis sanctam undique Christi ecclesiam ab incursu paganorum et ab infidelium devastatione armis defendere foris, et intus catholicae fidei agnitione munire. For other expressions of the same idea by Charlemagne, see *Capitularia regum Francorum;* ed. Alfredus Boretius, MGH, Leges, Sectio II, Tomus I, #12, 1, p. 44; #33, 5, p. 93; #45, 15, p. 129.

[50] The best discussion of the general idea involved here is H. X. Arquillière, *L'Augustinisme politique* (Paris, 1934).

[51] Alcuin, *Ep.* #171; ed. Dummler, MGH, Ep. IV, 282.

[52] *Epistolae variorum Carolo Magno regnante scriptae* #20; ed. Dümmler, MGH, Ep. IV, 528-529, for a letter written by Charlemagne to Queen Fastrada expressing the idea that the victory over the Avars in 796 was a God-given one.

[53] *Codex Carolinus* #50; ed. Gundlach, MGH, Ep. III, 570: extensis palmis ad aethera, regi regum et domino dominantium opimas laudes retulimus, enixius deprecantes ineffabilem eius divinam clementiam . . . multipliciter de hostibus victorias tribuat omnesque barbaras nationes vestris substernat vestigiis.

[54] Nearly every letter in the *Codex Carolinus* centres around this idea.

[55] *Ibid.*, #16, p. 513: . . . Deus omnipotens ex utero matris tuae te predistinatum habens, ideo te benedicens et in regem ungens, defensorem te et liberatorem sanctae suae ecclesias constituit. . . For the same idea, see *ibid.*, #6, 20, 22, 26, 33, 35, 36, 98, 99, pp. 488-489, 522, 526, 530, 539-540, 543, 544, 649-650, 652; Leo III, *Epistolae X*, #2; ed. Karolus Hampe, MGH, Ep. V, 89.

[56] For examples, see *Codex Carolinus*, #39, 45; ed. Gundlach, MGH, Ep. III, 551-552, 561.

[57] *Ibid.*, #61, pp. 588-589.

[58] *Ibid.*, #22, 34, pp. 526, 541-542; Leo III, *Epistolae X*, #2, 9; ed. Hampe, MGH, Ep. V, 89, 101.

[59] For the use of this expression see *Codex Carolinus* #17, 20; ed. Gundlach, MGH, Ep. III, 516, 522.

[60] *Ibid.*, #3, 11, 33, 39, 42, 43, 68, 98, 99, pp. 479-480, 505, 539-540, 551-552, 554-555, 557, 597, 649, 652.

These expressions demonstrate that the reasoning used by the popes to justify their pleas for Frankish help in the eighth and early ninth centuries reflected most of the ideas upon which Carolingian theocratic concepts were based. The popes who argued so insistently in the context cited above ought to be given credit for their contribution in schooling the Carolingian princes in the ideas that produced the brilliant missionary successes. The feat of inspiring the heirs of a Merovingian mayor of the palace to become rulers with a deep sense of responsibility for the welfare of Christendom was perhaps the most fundamental development of the eighth century. Those who partook of the effort were shapers of almost every success enjoyed by the Carolingian rulers. In this sense, then, one might conclude that the papacy played a larger missionary role than the missionary record spanning the years 750 to 850 alone shows. Several popes helped to mold the thinking of the dynasty of kings who dedicated themselves to serving the Church and defending it against its enemies. Out of this sense of duty came, at least in part, the Carolingian urge to spread the faith and as a result the successful wars against paganism. The papacy felt no misgivings about the course of events; their "adopted sons"[62] performed well in doing what the popes had so long begged them to do, namely, to assume the responsibility for the safety and welfare of Christendom. They were in no sense aware of being deprived of participation in the missionary ventures of the period; instead they stood in their rightful position as shepherd of the flock, having shaped a mighty instrument for defeating God's enemies in the shape of the "strong right arm"[63] of the Franks, "the propagators and defenders of the Christian religion."[64]

V.

By the middle of the ninth century the royal missionary effort of the Carolingians began to falter. Internal difficulties continually detracted the rulers from missionary affairs and interfered with missionary work already in progress.[1] Barbarian assaults against the weakened Carolingian state became bolder, resulting in devastating effects on newly established Christian outposts.[2] Slavic states on the eastern frontier defied the Carolingians more openly than ever and caused a growing concern, especially in the realm of Louis the German.[3] By 860 the troubled empire was considerably less able to uphold the cross than it had been earlier in the century. Certainly the hopes for expansion had dimmed considerably, as Anskar's travail in Denmark and Sweden demonstrated so clearly.

The paralysis among the Franks set the stage for a new outburst of papal missionary activity. Nicholas I, exhibiting the same forcefulness that characterized his whole policy, was chiefly responsible for thrusting the papacy into a position of leadership in missionary affairs after a long period of inactivity. Indeed, his far-reaching schemes for adding to the Christian realm, all of them powerfully motivated by his strong sense of papal overlordship over Christian affairs, was one of the most notable features of his pontificate. His policies virtually determined papal missionary interests for the rest of the ninth century.

---

[61] *Ibid.*, #8, 13, 17, 24, 26, 35, 37, 50, 52, 53, 55, 62, 66, 68, 72, 73, 75, 88, 89, 92, 99, pp. 498, 510, 516, 528, 531, 543, 550, 570, 574, 575, 579, 589-590, 594, 597, 603, 604, 606, 625, 626, 630, 652.

[62] *Ibid.*, #10, p. 501.

[63] For examples of the papal use of this expression, see *ibid.*, #13, 59, 98, 99, pp. 510, 585, 649, 651.

[64] As Charlemagne was addressed by Theodomar, abbot of Montecassino; *Epistolae variorum Carolo Magno regnante scriptae* #13; ed. Dümmler, MGH, Ep. IV, 510.

[1] Rimbert, *Vita Anskarii*, 21; ed. Waitz, pp. 46-47, relates how the death of Louis the Pious and the division of his empire deprived Anskar of a monastery located in western Francia which had been one of his chief sources of material support in his northern mission.

[2] *Ibid.*, 16-18, pp. 37-39, for the drastic effects of a Danish raid on the missionary center at Hamburg and the repercussions on missionary work in general.

[3] See especially, Dümmler, *Geschichte des ostfränkischen Reiches* I, 426, 427; II, 21-25, for an estimate of the Slavic threat, especially from the Moravians.

One of Nicholas' first missionary concerns was to lend his assistance to the tenuous Scandinavian mission. Anskar had for many years been struggling to win new advantages in Denmark, chiefly by exerting his personal influence over the Danish rulers. He enjoyed some success in his relationship with Horic II, in spite of the latter's initial hostility to Christianity.[4] In 864 an emissary of Louis the German was able to report to Nicholas that Horic would soon accept baptism, news which prompted Nicholas to rejoice and to pray that the conversion would soon occur. Horic himself added to these high hopes by sending gifts to Rome.[5] Nicholas, in an action that had not been paralleled since the pontificate of Gregory II, immediately addressed a letter to Horic urging his conversion. The pope's argument centered around two fundamental points: the power of the Christian God and the blessings of eternal life. He took pains to contrast the impotence of the "deaf, mute, and blind idols" that Horic now worshipped with the "Almighty, all-embracing, indescribable, immense, infinite, simple, unchangeable, uncircumscribed, immortal, all good, all merciful, all holy" Christian God. Only the Christian God could provide the king with a relief from the miseries, dangers, strife, insecurity, and fleeting glory of the present life, where all the kingdoms that man could create disappear as a result of the ambitions of other men or of death. Only the true God could give that life "where there is joy without sorrow, fullness without nausea, continued health, indefinite life, peace without end, constant security, and eternal glory." Moreover, the Christian God was alone capable of aiding his servants in the affairs of this life.[6] Throughout the appeal Nicholas sought to place Christianity in a context that might be understood by a Danish prince who ruled over a state long torn by internal strife and constantly engaged in warfare and who perhaps had demonstrated his envy for his prosperous Christian neighbors, the Franks, by his raids on their territories.

Nicholas also acted to strengthen the Scandinavian mission by lending his authority to the settlement of the long standing dispute over the combined see of Hamburg-Bremen, which Louis the German had created as a missionary outpost. The archbishop of Cologne insisted that Bremen pertained to his province and demanded that it be returned to him. In 864 Louis referred the case to Rome in order to confirm a decision made by a royal synod in opposition to the claims of Cologne. Anskar sent a representative to present his case.[7] Nicholas ordered that the existing arrangement be respected. Bremen was to remain separate from Cologne and was to continue to serve as archiepiscopal see for the Danes and the Swedes. Nicholas' defence of his action was based primarily on the necessity of this arrangement as a missionary step. He called attention to the poverty of Hamburg, especially since it had lost the monastery of Turholt, located in the kingdom of Charles the Bald. Following the action of Gregory IV he also granted Anskar the pallium and renewed the commission of Anskar to preach to the Danes, Swedes, Slavs, and all others located in those parts. Nicholas threatened to anathematize any who interfered with this settlement in the future.[8] In no sense did Nicholas' action represent a radical departure from established policy. He repeatedly indicated that his action was nothing more than a confirmation of a previous papal action and the dictates of the German rulers. Nonetheless, his firm support of the attempt to maintain an archiepiscopal see as a spearhead for missionary work in Scandinavia probably proved valuable to Anskar. Just prior to his death in 865 Anskar sent to the German king and to German bishops a letter containing his papal privileges. He begged everyone to respect their provisions as an assurance of the future well-being of the mission in the north.[9] Certainly he was able to end his life with his archiepiscopal see intact and to leave as his successor a tried disciple, Rimbert, who soon received the pallium from Nicholas and thus was able to carry on the missions.[10]

---

[4] Rimbert, *Vita Anskarii*, 31-32; ed. Waitz, pp. 63-64.

[5] Nicholas, *Ep.* #26, 27; ed. Ernestus Perels, MGH, Ep. VI, 292-294, reports these events.

[6] *Ibid.*, #27, pp. 293-294.

[7] The main events of this dispute are outlined in Rimbert, *Vita Anskarii*, 23; ed. Waitz, pp. 48-51.

[8] Nicholas reported his decision to Louis the German in *Ep.* #26; ed. Perels, MGH, Ep. VI, 291-292. His bull confirming the see of Hamburg-Bremen (see PL 119, 876-879; Rimbert, *Vita Anskarii*, 23; ed. Waitz, pp. 49-51) supplies his justification for his action and grants to Anskar once again the necessary missionary powers.

Nicholas may also have tried to lend papal assistance in still another area in the process of being converted. Sometime during his pontificate he wrote to a certain Osbald in Carinthia, giving him instructions on how to deal with disciplinary problems among the clergy there, including that of handling priests who had killed pagans.[11] Osbald was serving as chorepiscopus in Carinthia, having been assigned to that position by the archbishop of Salzburg, to whose province Carinthia pertained. Heretofore, this missionary venture had been tightly controlled by Salzburg.[12] Osbald's request for guidance from Rome and Nicholas' reply without reference to the archbishop of Salzburg indicate a more independent papal policy. Perhaps Nicholas was aware that the Slavic princes in that area were restive under German rule and was encouraging a more independent attitude.

Meanwhile, a new victory for Christianity was in the making, offering to the papacy an opportunity for action in an area that had not previously been a concern of the western Church. In 865 the Bulgar king, Boris, accepted baptism from a Byzantine ecclesiastic and undertook to convert his kingdom.[13] His decision was probably influenced by the steady penetration of his kingdom by Greek influences, including Christianity, for many years prior to 865. Diplomatic considerations, however, provided the immediate impetus. Boris had allied himself with the Franks in 863 for the purpose of destroying the powerful Moravian state that had disquieted both Boris and Louis the German. Boris indicated a willingness to accept Christianity as a part of the Frankish agreement, although no immediate steps were taken to affect his conversion.[14] The Moravians countered this alliance by seeking aid in Constantinople. When a famine struck Boris' kingdom in 864, the Byzantine armies invaded his territory and forced Boris to surrender. Included in the price he paid for peace was the acceptance of Christianity. Once having made his decision and in spite of a revolt by some of his subjects against the new religion,[15] Boris went about the task of converting his people with vigor. At first he was guided by the Byzantine church. Not only were Greek clergymen sent into his territory; no less a person than the patriarch Photius sent a long letter of guidance to Boris, laying upon his royal shoulders most of the responsibility for the Christianization of the Bulgars and pointing out the steps which the Bulgars needed to take before being acceptable as civilized Christians.[16] For some reason, perhaps the refusal of Photius to concede ecclesiastical independence to the Bulgar church, Boris grew tired of his bargain with the Greeks. In 866 he sent representatives to the West seeking aid for his new Christian establishment.

---

[9] *Epistolae variorum inde a saeculo nono medio usque ad morten Karoli II (Calvi) imperatoris collectae* #16; ed. Ernestus Dümmler, MGH, Ep. VI, 163; Rimbert, *Vita Anskarii*, 41; ed. Waitz, p. 75; *Vita Rimberti*, 11; ed. G. Waitz, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol. (Hanover, 1894), pp. 89-90.

[10] PL 119, 962.

[11] Nicholas, *Ep.* #142; ed. Perels, MGH, Ep. VI, 660-661.

[12] For missionary developments in this area about this time, see *De Conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum libellus*, 9-14; ed. Wattenbach, MGH, SS. XI, 10-14.

[13] The chief sources for the actual conversion of the Bulgar king are Greek and present conflicting accounts. For an examination of these sources and for the background of Boris' conversion see Dvornik, *Les Slaves, Byzance, et Rome au IXᵉ siècle*, pp. 99-104, 184-190; J. B. Bury, *A History of the Eastern Empire from the Fall of Irene to the Accession of Basil I (A.D. 802-867)* (London, 1912), pp. 381-386; Matthew Spinka, *A History of Christianity in the Balkans*, in *Studies in Church History* I, ed. Matthew Spinka and Robert Hastings Nichols (Chicago, 1933), pp. 25-33.

[14] Louis so reported to Rome; Nicholas, *Ep.* #26; ed. Perels, MGH, Ep. VI, 293. See also *Annales Bertiniani*, a. 864; ed. G. Waitz, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol. (Hanover, 1883), p. 72.

[15] *Ann. Bertiniani*, a. 866; ed. Waitz, pp. 85-86, describes this revolt; there are also references to it in Nicholas, *Ep.* #99; ed. Perels, MGH, Ep. VI, 577; Ioannes Zonoras, *Epitomae Historiarum* XVI, 2; ed. Theodorus Büttner-Wobst, *Corpus Scriptores Historiae Byzantinae* III (Bonn, 1897), 387-389; Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia* IV, 14-15; ed. I. Bekker, *Corpus Scriptores Historiae Byzantinae* (Bonn, 1838), pp. 163-165.

One Bulgar delegation appeared at Regensburg to solicit the aid of Louis the German. In 867 the bishop of Passau went to Bulgaria with a party of priests equipped for missionary work. Upon his arrival the bishop found the field already occupied by a mission sent from Rome and thereupon withdrew.[17] The presence of Roman missionaries in Bulgaria was the result of Nicholas' prompt response to Boris' other delegation, which had been sent to Rome, where it arrived in August, 866. The Bulgars arrived in Rome bearing gifts and requesting from Nicholas priests for missionary service and advice on a series of pressing problems connected with the institution of the new religion in Bulgaria.[18] This perhaps was a development Nicholas had not expected. Two years before in 864 he seemed content to entrust the spread of Christianity in Bulgaria to the Germans; at that time he had received the news of a treaty between the Franks and the Bulgars with joy and indicated his anticipation of the news of the Bulgar conversion, which Louis the German reported was imminent, offering only to pray for the success of the venture.[19] In 866 he showed no such deference to other potential missionary agencies. Instead he promptly assumed the leadership of the new Christian establishment in Bulgaria and undertook to shape it according to his wishes.

His first action was to direct a party of missionary priests to Bulgaria, ordering them to preach to the Bulgars, many of whom were not yet baptized. Nicholas was not content to let the Bulgar situation rest at this point. At the head of the mission he placed two important bishops, Formosus of Porta and Paul of Populonia. These men were carefully prepared for their task. Nicholas gave them instructions prior to their departure.[20] He empowered them to settle a wide variety of problems posed by Boris in his request for information from the pope. The bishops were fully equipped with a collection of canons, a missal, and a penitential to serve as guides in their assault on paganism and their attempts to create a religious establishment in Bulgaria.[21] Most important of all, the legates were authorized to take steps toward organizing the Bulgarian church. Nicholas empowered them to consecrate new bishops when necessary. They were ordered to report back to Rome on the number of Christians in Bulgaria, whereupon the papacy would decide whether an archiepiscopal see was warranted and would create one if necessary. He would permit the Bulgars to choose a candidate for that see from among the bishops operating in their land. Nicholas made it perfectly clear, however, that Boris' dream of a patriarchate was out of the question.[22] In setting forth so clear a program for his legates, the pope created a definite procedure within which the conversion and final organization of Bulgaria could be completed.

---

[16] PG 102, 628-698. Nicholas' long letter to Boris in 866 (*Ep.* #99; ed. Perels, MGH, Ep. VI, 568-600) shows the heavy influence of the Greek clergy in Bulgaria and makes several references to the presence of the Greeks.

[17] *Ann. Bertiniani*, a. 866; ed. Waitz, p. 86; *Ann. Fuldenses*, a. 866, 867; ed Fridericus Kurze, MGH, SS. rer. Germ. in usum schol. (Hanover, 1891), pp. 65-66.

[18] *Liber pontificalis* II, ed. Duchesne, p. 164.

[19] Nicholas, *Ep.* #26; ed. Perels, MGH, Ep. VI, 293.

[20] *Liber pontificalis* II, ed. Duchesne, p. 164; Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *Epistolae sive Praefationes* #5; ed. E. Perels and G. Laehr, MGH, Ep. VII, 412.

[21] The nature of Nicholas' orders to his bishops is revealed in his letter to Boris containing the one hundred and six responses to questions raised by the latter; *Ep.* #99; ed. Perels, MGH, Ep. VI, 568-600; see especially 106, pp. 599-600.

[22] *Ibid.*, 72-73, pp. 592-593.

Nicholas, realizing the role that the Bulgar king must play in the Christianization of the Bulgars, did not neglect to encourage and enlighten him. The papal legates departed for Bulgaria bearing books that Boris requested, including a collection of laws, penitentials, and a missal. They also bore a remarkable document containing answers to questions raised by Boris through his ambassadors to Rome.[23] The content reveals that the papacy realized clearly the difficulties besetting Boris in his new venture. "You [Boris] beseeched us as a suppliant that we bestow upon you just as on other peoples a true and perfect Christianity, having no blemishes or flaws. You say that there came into your land many from diverse places, i.e., Greeks, Armenians, and those from elsewhere, who according to their own will, spoke in many and various ways. On account of this you ask to be told which of all of these in their various interpretations to obey and what you ought to do." Confusion, lack of order, absence of a final authority thus offset all the good intentions of Boris in his attempts to convert his people. The papacy could fill this need. "In truth we are not sufficient in these things, but our sufficiency is in God. Blessed Peter, who lives and presides in his see, gives to those who seek the truth. For the Holy Roman Church was always without blemish or flaw . . ."[24] Nicholas placed himself as the final authority on any problem concerning the faith and its practice. In this capacity he had an answer for any problem presented by Boris and proceeded to set forth his answers in full.

Nicholas' responses ranged over a variety of subects. The question of proper religious observances was obviously foremost in Boris' mind. Nicholas laid down concise rules on such things as the performance of baptism (c. 14, 15, 71, 104), the administration of communion (c. 9, 65, 71), burial customs (c. 98, 99, 100), conduct of the laity at church services (c. 54, 58, 66, 68), the necessary religious preparations prior to battle (c. 33, 35, 36), prayer (c. 53, 56, 61), religious processions (c. 7, 8), dietary observances (c. 4, 5, 53, 57, 60, 90, 91), and the observance of feast days (c. 10, 11, 12, 33, 36). He sent a missal and a penitential for enlightening the Bulgars on the proper reading of the mass and on the treatment of sinners (c. 75, 76), entrusting to his legates to explain the use of each. He was especially explicit in explaining the major observances for the Lenten season (c. 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50). Marriage regulations and sexual practices also received major attention (c. 2, 3, 4, 29, 39, 48, 49, 50, 51, 63, 64, 68, 96). From this list it becomes obvious that Nicholas intended to be considered the final authority on all matters concerning ritual and discipline. What topics had not been dealt with in his letter were left to his legates, "who would instruct [Boris] and inform [him] abundantly of what [he] ought to do."[25] Rome, then, assumed the responsibility for instituting the proper religious observances in a newly converted land.

Nicholas did not confine his advice on religious matters to problems of ritual and discipline only. He provided Boris with a set of principles to be used in completing the conversion of his subjects. He ordered that the king refrain from forceful conversions. Admonitions and pleas were the only valid means of softening the hardened hearts of pagans. Nicholas suggested that it might be effective to cease dining or associating with pagans as a means of impressing upon them the gravity of their adherence to paganism. In the final analysis God would act in His own time to convert them (c. 41, 102). The case of apostates was somewhat different. The pope advised stern measures for those who would not return to Christianity after proper warning (c. 18). As a step towards the completion of the conversion of Bulgaria Nicholas explained the basic principles of the organization of the universal church and informed Boris of the position of the Bulgar church in that scheme (c. 72, 73, 92, 93, 106). Wherever church organization was considered, Nicholas made Rome's primacy explicit. He warned Boris that the problem of discipline of the clergy was not within royal power, laying down the principle that temporal authorities were to be judged and not to judge wherever the interests of the clergy were at stake (c. 83). Nicholas again demonstrated a broad concept of papal missionary responsibility. Everything from proselytizing to the organization of a new church must proceed under papal supervision and through papal guidance.

---

[23] This letter, cited above in note 21, will be referred to in the following paragraphs simply by inserting the proper chapter number into the text, unless there is some necessity of including additional material, in which case a footnote will be used.

[24] *Ibid.*, 106, pp. 599-600: Postremo deprecamini nos suppliciter, ut vobis, quemadmodum ceteris gentibus, veram et perfectam Christianitatem non habentem maculam aut rugam largiamur, asserentes, quod in patriam vestram multi ex diversis locis Christiani advenerint, qui, prout voluntas eorum existit, multa et varia loquuntur, id est Graeci, Armeni et ex caeteris locis. Quapropter juberi poscitis, utrum omnibus his secundum varios sensus eorum oboedire an quid facere debeatis. Verum nos in his non sumus sufficientes, 'sed sufficientis nostra ex Deo est;' et beatus Petrus, qui in sede sua vivit et praesidet, dat quaerentibus fidei veritatem. Nam et sancta Romana ecclesia semper sine macula fuit et sine ruga. . . .

[25] *Ibid.*, 106, p. 600: qui vos instruant et, quid agere debeatis, abundanter erudiant.

On still another score Nicholas placed himself in a position of guide and mentor to the recently converted king. He undertook to furnish advice concerning a wide range of civil affairs connected with Boris' governance of his people. Nicholas made the assumption throughout his letter that temporal affairs had a relevance to the spiritual order and fell within the papal domain. As a guide to the conduct of civil affairs Nicholas sent a law code with his legates, advising Boris to use it only with the advice of those capable of interpreting it (c. 13). Besides this general guide in civil affairs, Nicholas offered the king his opinion on such problems as treatment of rebels (c. 17, 19), judicial procedures (c. 12, 45, 84, 86), handling of fugitives (c. 20, 21, 25), the conduct of war (c. 23, 33, 36, 40, 46), the punishment of certain criminals (c. 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31), diplomatic relations (c. 80, 81, 82), and the treatment of slaves (c. 97). Boris was led to believe that the Church through its head possessed the wisdoms to guide a king in his rule over a Christian kingdom.

As impressive as the range of subjects on which Nicholas offered guidance was the spirit in which the advice was offered. The pope approached all the Bulgar problems with an attitude of leniency arising from his realization that he was dealing with new converts who could not be expected to practice Christianity perfectly. Strict observance of the laws of abstinence were not required because the pope, realizing that the Bulgars "were up to now pagan and still ought to be nourished on milk, could not put a heavy yoke on [them] until [they] were ready for solid food."[26] He took special pains to refute those teachers of the Bulgars who were insisting on a strict observance of Old Testament rules, especially in matters of diet (c. 43), seeking to avoid making the new faith too heavy a burden. Nicholas was satisfied that for the moment the Bulgars believed in God and were baptized. He was firm in counseling a repudiation of pagan customs, especially those that reflected idolatry (c. 33, 35, 40, 55, 63, 67, 79). However, he did not heap scorn on Bulgar customs and conceded that some of them, like the custom of wearing pantaloons (c. 59) or of the king taking his meals apart from all company (c. 42), need not be rejected. Whenever he called upon Boris to end an obnoxious practice, Nicholas was careful to supply a substitute. For instance, he advised that the Bulgars carry a cross into battle as an insignia in place of the traditional horse's tail (c. 33; see also c. 35, 40, 55). Even where he was aware that the Bulgars were being misled by the Greeks, Nicholas engaged in no vituperation, which might have been expected in view of his quarrel with the Greek church. He simply disposed of Greek error by

[26] *Ibid.*, 4, p. 571: Nos tamen vobis, qui, ut praetulimus, adhuc rudes estis, et lacte tamquam parvuli nutriendi, non grave possumus iugum, donec ad solidum cibum veniatis, imponere.

citing Roman practices or teachings (c. 6, 54, 57, 77). He almost always justified his comments on any problem by giving a reason for his decision, thus avoiding an authoritarian attitude. For instance, when condemning the Bulgar practice of killing anyone who tried to flee his native land, Nicholas argued that there might be a just reason for flight and cited cases from sacred history to prove his point (c. 20, 25). Everywhere in the letter Nicholas tried to insinuate a teaching which would uplift his new pupil to a higher level of morality and fuller understanding of Christian doctrine. Boris, for instance, was concerned over his own brutal treatment of those who had rebelled against him when he had first undertaken to convert his subjects. Nicholas pointed out his failure but offered mercy and forgiveness (c. 17; see also c. 1, 2). Boris upon receipt of this letter must have been convinced that he had found a fitting guide for his task. He must have been assured that his work was progressing properly. The pope was thereby furthering the expansion of religion by his gentle, persuasive, encouraging attitude toward a king with great troubles and a people only slightly aware of the implications of the new religion.

The Bulgar mission, so thoroughly prepared by the papacy, started its work auspiciously. According to Roman sources,[27] Nicholas' missionary party began teaching, baptizing, building churches, instituting the Christian ritual, and imposing the Christian way of life on the Bulgars. Even Greek sources vouch for the effectiveness of the papal move. Photius complained to the eastern patriarchs that heretical teachings and practices were being instituted among the Bulgars by the Romans and asked for support in offsetting this development.[28] Boris was reported to have been so well pleased that he drove out all alien clergymen and declared that he would never adhere to any authority except Rome. Papal leadership had seemingly shaped a splendid and rapid victory for Christ.

However, the Bulgar mission was not entirely free from difficulties. Two situations, neither of them having too much to do with the actual missionary problem, disturbed the scene. First, Boris was not happy with the provisions Nicholas made for the ecclesiastical organization of Bulgaria. In 867 he sent a new emissary to Rome asking that Formosus be made archbishop for Bulgaria. Nicholas refused the request, but sought to avoid alienating Boris by preparing a new mission, headed by two more Italian bishops, Dominic and Grimoald, and including carefully selected priests. He prepared letters advising Boris that he might select an archbishop from this group.[29] A second situation arose from the fact that the Greeks were bending every effort to reestablish the authority of the patriarch of Constantinople over the Bulgars. Nicholas revealed their efforts in a series of letters written to various lay and ecclesiastical personages in Francia in 867. He related that the Greek emperor was using diplomatic pressure to discredit the papal legates and that the Greeks were spreading rumors of Roman heresy among the Bulgars.[30] Other sources suggest that the Greeks used bribes and "sophisticated arguments" to detach the Bulgars from Rome.[31] A jurisdictional struggle was emerging to confuse the situation among the Bulgars and divert the papacy from missionary work in the strict sense.[32] However, Nicholas' death in November, 867, relieved him both of the burden of dealing with the Greek offensive and of answering Boris' demands for greater ecclesiastical independence.

---

[27] The chief ones reporting on the progress of the first mission of Nicholas are *Liber pontificalis* II, ed. Duchesne, pp. 165, 185; Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *Epistolae sive Praefationes* #5; ed. Perels and Laehr, MGH, Ep. VII, 412.

[28] PG 102, 722-738.

[29] *Liber pontificalis* II, ed. Duchesne, p. 165.

[30] Nicholas, *Ep.* #100-102; ed. Perels, MGH, Ep. VI, 600-610; *Ann. Fuldenses,* a. 868; ed. Kurze, pp. 66-67.

[31] *Liber pontificalis* II, ed. Duchesne, p. 185; Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *Epistolae sive Praefationes* #5; ed. Perels and Laehr, MGH, Ep. VII, 413.

[32] For the background and larger issues of that jurisdictional dispute, see F. Dvornik, *Les Légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance* (Prague, 1933), pp. 248-283.

Before his death Nicholas had still another opportunity for exerting an influence on missionary affairs. In 863 the Moravian prince, Rastislav, appealed to Constantinople for aid in completing the conversion of his people. Christianity had already made some progress in Moravia, chiefly as a result of German activity. Rastislav was not completely happy either with the religious state of his subjects or with the German political power which accompanied German missionaries. The Greeks answered his request by sending two Slavic speaking missionaries, Cyril and Methodius, to Moravia. They enjoyed immense success, due chiefly to their use of a Slavic ritual. By 867 there was a need for an organization for Moravia. Since neither of the missionaries was a bishop, the pair left Moravia to find authorities qualified to assist them in organizing the Moravian church. Their exact destination has remained a mystery. Nicholas, having heard of their fame and perhaps suspicious of their orthodoxy, invited them to Rome. Probably he was chiefly interested in assuming leadership over this new missionary venture. However, he did not live to greet the missionaries or direct their future work.[33]

Nicholas died leaving a great deal of missionary work unfinished. A new Bulgar mission was almost ready to leave Rome to continue a major project there. Two successful Greek missionaries with powerful though disputed influence in Moravia were on their way to Rome to consult with the papacy. These ventures, coupled with his efforts in Scandinavia, mark him as a major influence in missionary affairs. True, he had not taken the initiative in planting Christianity in pagan lands. His policy was opportunistic. However, he acted with vigor wherever there was a chance of advancing the Christian cause. He used his personal influence to persuade princes to promote Christianity. He was especially effective in organizing missionary resources. He was quick to proffer practical advice on any kind of problem relative to the Christianization of a new territory. In all of this he was bolder than any pope had been for a long time, seldom deferring to another missionary agency that had a stake in a missionary venture. He came close to making the papal see a missionary headquarters from which emanated missionary personnel, regulations, advice, and final decisions extending to far-flung missionary frontiers. Once again the papacy was a major force in missionary affairs after lingering so long in the shadows of the Carolingian rulers.

Hadrian II (867-872) acted promptly to carry on Nicholas' policy. The Bulgar mission demanded his first attention. He immediately dispatched Nicholas' mission, led by the bishops Dominic and Grimoald, to Bulgaria, sending with them the letters which Nicholas had prepared but to which Hadrian now added his name. Boris had requested this mission in order to secure a satisfactory archbishop. Throughout the next two years that problem dominated the relationship between Rome and Bulgaria. Late in 867, after the departure of the above mentioned mission, Boris sent another representative to Rome in the company of bishops Paul and Formosus, whom Nicholas had first sent to Bulgaria. This time Boris requested that Hadrian send a certain deacon, Marinus, or some cardinal to be made archbishop. Hadrian refused this request on the grounds that Marinus had been assigned as a legate to a forthcoming council in Constantinople. The pope sent a subdeacon, Sylvester, who was accompanied by bishops Leopard of Ancona and Dominic of Trevi. Sylvester was also unsatisfactory, since Boris soon made a new request that Formosus or some other suitable candidate be sent. Once again Hadrian wrote asking that Boris select another.[34] Obviously the organization of the Bulgar church under Roman auspices had reached an impasse resulting from Boris' desire for independence. Hadrian had little power to compel the king to accept papal dictates.

---

[33] The chief sources for the beginning of the Moravian mission are chapters 14-17 of the Slavic biography of Cyril and chapters 5-6 of the Slavic biography of Methodius. For the text of these chapters in a French translation see Dvornik, *Les Légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance*, pp. 372-379, 385-386. These biographies will be cited hereafter as *Vie de Constantin*, tr. Dvornik, and *Vie de Méthode*, tr. Dvornik, with appropriate chapter and page numbers. See also *Vita [sancti Cyrilli] cum translatione s. Clementis*, 7-8, *Acta Sanctorum*, March II, 21. Dvornik's comments on these accounts are especially valuable in settling some of the difficulties connected with them.

While negotiations between Hadrian and Boris continued, Boris apparently decided to seek his ends in Constantinople. As has previously been mentioned, the Greeks had continued to exert pressure on Boris since he first turned to Rome in 866. It is entirely possible that he was promised his archbishop if he would again accept allegiance to Constantinople. Internal troubles in his kingdom increased the frightful possibility of Greek intervention in Bulgar affairs, a threat that Rome could not utilize in pressuring Boris to accept its program. For whatever reason, Boris sent an emissary to Constantinople in 869 at the time that an important council was being held to restore peace between Rome and Constantinople.[35] At the conclusion of that council in February, 870, the Bulgars were given an audience before the Roman legates, the representatives of the eastern patriarchs, and the patriarch of Constantinople, Ignatius, and asked for a decision as to which authority, Rome or Constantinople, Bulgaria pertained. In spite of the attempts of the papal legates to defend Rome's rights on grounds of Rome's possession of the Bulgar territory prior to the barbarian invasions and Rome's leading role in the conversion of Bulgaria, the decision went in favor of Constantinople. Boris' return to Constantinople had probably been arranged prior to this meeting. Beyond threatening Ignatius with papal retaliation for permitting this development, the papal legates were powerless. Hadrian, who did not know of the procedure until long after it had happened, had been completely outmaneuvered by Greek diplomacy.[36]

The return of the Bulgars to Constantinople was fatal to the papal missionary establishment in Bulgaria. Ignatius immediately appointed an archbishop[37] for the Bulgars and sent Greek clergymen into the territory. The Romans, including Grimoald, who was serving as papal legate at the time, were expelled. The Bulgar king presented Rome with a series of complaints as an excuse for his move.[38] Hadrian took the only course open to him, namely, to pressure the Greeks to repudiate the affair, threatening the emperor and especially Ignatius with dire consequences if they did not acquiesce.[39] His efforts were fruitless; the Christian establishment in Bulgaria had escaped Rome and with it Nicholas' dream of a major addition to Rome's sphere of influence.

Hadrian's failure in Bulgaria was offset, however, by his successful exploitation of the Moravian missionaries, Cyril and Methodius. Nicholas' death made it necessary for Hadrian to greet them when they arrived at Rome. This he did in a most fitting fashion, creating the impression that Rome accepted their work without question. Especially significant was the fact that Hadrian in a public ceremony blessed the books containing the Slavic liturgy used by the Greek missionaries and permitted the performance of that liturgy in several important churches in Rome. He also ordained certain of the disciples of the missionaries as priests; perhaps Methodius was in that group. While the missionaries were thus honored by the papacy, Cyril died. Methodius desired to return his body to his home, but was persuaded either by Hadrian or by Cyril before his death to abandon that project. This was an important matter, since a new missionary venture in which Methodius would play an important part was being constructed by Hadrian.[40]

---

[34] *Liber pontificalis* II, ed. Duchesne, p. 185.

[35] For the background of this important council, see Amann, *L'époque carolingienne*, pp. 465-489.

[36] *Liber pontificalis* II, ed. Duchesne, pp. 182-185; Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *Epistolae sive Praefationes* #5; ed. Perels and Laehr, MGH, Ep. VII, 413-415.

[37] A letter of John VIII identifies Ignatius' appointee as an archbishop; John VIII, *Fragmenta Registri* #9; ed. Ericus Caspar, MGH, Ep. VII, 278.

[38] *Liber pontificalis* II, ed. Duchesne, p. 185.

[39] Hadrian II, *Ep.* #41-42; ed. E. Perels, MGH, Ep. VI, 759-762.

Cyril and Methodius had obviously pleased Rastislav in Moravia. On their journey to Rome they had passed through the lands of Kocel, a prince of Moravian origin ruling in Carinthia under the tutelage of Louis the German. Kocel had also been impressed by the Greeks and especially by their Slavic ritual and desired their services in his land. He requested that the papacy send the Greeks to Carinthia to serve as teachers. Here was a situation comparable to that presented to Nicholas when Boris of Bulgaria sent his legates to Rome in 866. Here were princes of partially Christianized lands asking Rome for assistance, bypassing those parties who already had an interest in their territories. Hadrian acted with as much vigor as did Nicholas. He sent Methodius and his disciples back to the Slavic princes. He also sent a letter addressed to Kocel, Rastislav, and Svatopluk, another Moravian prince, informing them that Methodius, a man of perfect orthodoxy and intelligence, was being sent as their teacher. Methodius had been commissioned to teach from the Slavic scripture, celebrate the mass in Slavic, and baptize in Slavic, the only reservation being that the epistle and gospel had to be read in Latin prior to the reading of the Slavic version. Hadrian threatened to punish anyone who interfered with the work of the papal missionary. He exhorted the princes to follow the guidance of Methodius.[41] Once again a missionary territory under the direct authority of Rome was staked out. Once again the papacy assumed the right to commission missionaries and guide their activities. Especially bold was Hadrian's permission to use the Slavic ritual, a practice that had already aroused suspicion in the West. Undoubtedly this precedent-breaking step was a concession to the Slavs in an attempt to attach them to Rome. Nonetheless, in view of the popularity of the native ritual, it proved a noteworthy addition to the western missionary method.

Methodius, upon leaving Rome on the papal mission, was greeted well by Kocel. Within a short time he was back in Rome in the company of a considerable number of nobles from Kocel's court, who asked that he be made bishop for Pannonia. Hadrian gladly elevated Methodius to the rank of archbishop, with a see at Sirmium, the site of the ancient see of Illyricum. Methodius was apparently given authority over Moravia as well as Pannonia. The pope now intended that the ecclesiastical organization of this vast new province proceed as rapidly as possible, this step to mark the conclusion of the missionary process which had begun independently of the papacy.[42]

Hadrian's death in 772 resulted in no major shift in papal policy. John VIII tried valiantly to sustain the papal program of lending assistance to the newly Christianized peoples, although he was sorely beset by serious problems nearer to Rome. He was especially concerned with developments in Bulgaria. His many letters on the Bulgar question show little interest in actual missionary problems, in spite of the fact that there were still many pagans in Bulgaria.[43] Occasionally he fretted lest certain Greek teachings and practices, considered heretical by Rome, become any more deeply implanted in the yet untutored minds of the Bulgars. John's real preoccupation centered around persuading Boris to return to Roman overlordship and compelling the imperial court to repudiate its claim to ecclesiastical authority over Bulgaria. To gain the first aim John kept a steady stream of letters flowing to Boris.[44] These letters were essentially the same in content. John tried to convince Boris that the Greeks taught a heretical brand of Christianity and that whoever followed it ran the danger of eternal damnation. In connection with this argument, John sought to build a case for the long-standing orthodoxy of Rome, a situation resulting from Rome's primacy dating from the time of St. Peter. John also tried to persuade Boris that Bulgaria had historically pertained to Rome and that Constantinople's assumption of authority in 870 was illegal. He insinuated into his letters the idea that the Greek motive for intervention in Bulgaria was chiefly the hope of gaining political control, whereas Rome's motive was not tainted by worldly ambitions but was concerned only with the care of souls and the proper organization of the infant church of Bulgaria. This line of argument was intended to prod the Bulgar spirit of independence against the ever-present danger of Greek political domination. Finally, John reminded Boris that the king had once made a promise to obey Rome and was now violating his oath. In addition to his letters to Boris, John sought to use his influence on the relatives, confidants, and advisers of Boris, asking them to plead the papal case before the king.[45] In spite of his efforts, Boris made no move toward repudiating Constantinople. His attitude excluded Roman influences completely from Bulgaria. Nothing but empty claims of authority remained of the papal attempt to take the responsibility for the Christianization of the Bulgars.

---

[40] *Vie de Constantin*, 17-18, tr. Dvornik, pp. 378-380; *Vie de Méthode*, 6-7, tr. Dvornik, p. 386; *Vita [sancti Cyrilli] cum translatione s. Clementis*, 8-12, *Acta Sanctorum*, March II, 21-22.

[41] *Vie de Méthode*, 8, tr. Dvornik, pp. 387-388.

[42] *Ibid.*, 8, p. 388. For a discussion of the territory assigned to Methodius, see Ernst Dümmler, "Die pannonische Legende vom heilige Methodius," *Archiv für österreichische Geschichts-Quellen*, XIII (1854), 185-189; Dvornik, *Les Légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance*, pp. 267-275.

[43] A biography of one of Methodius' disciples, driven out of Moravian territory in 885, gives evidence of the existence of paganism as a major problem in Bulgaria after that date; see *Vita s. Clementis*, 17-18; PG 126, 1224-1225.

John also battled to force the Greeks to concede Bulgaria to Rome. His policy centered around exploiting the religious difficulties within the Empire and the imperial desire for peace with Rome. He pleaded with Basil I to correct the injustice committed by the patriarch of Constantinople in assuming authority over Bulgaria.[46] Against Ignatius and his clergy John was more severe. In a letter written in April, 878, he demanded that Ignatius withdraw all Greek clergy from Bulgaria within thirty days and threatened to depose the patriarch if he did not comply. John indicated that this action was the culmination of previous warnings.[47] The same order was directed to the Greek bishops and other clergy in Bulgaria.[48] This policy of threatening to use ecclesiastical weapons to cause trouble within the Byzantine church seemed to bear fruit in 879 and 880, when the emperor was seeking papal recognition for Photius, chosen to succeed Ignatius but extremely suspect in Rome as a result of his previous career as patriarch. As one of the conditions for recognizing Photius John was able to secure a repudiation of Greek authority over Bulgaria.[49] Seemingly the papacy had gained its end. John was again free to send his ministers into Bulgaria to complete the conversion of that land, as he indicated was his intention in his letter to the Greek clergy in Bulgaria in 878.

However, his victory was a hollow one, as two letters written to Boris in 881 and 882 so clearly reveal. In the midst of fulsome expressions of joy over the turn of events that had put Boris under Roman authority, John wondered why the king had failed to send messengers to Rome for instructions. He reminded

---

[44] John VIII, *Ep.* #66, 182, 192, 198; ed. Caspar, MGH, Ep. VII, 58-60, 146, 153-154, 158-159; John VIII, *Fragmenta Registri* #7, 37; ed. Caspar, MGH, Ep. VII, 277, 294-295.

[45] John VIII, *Ep.* #67, 70, 183; ed. Caspar, MGH, Ep. VII, 60-62, 65-66, 147.

[46] *Ibid.*, #69, pp. 63-65; John VIII, *Fragmenta Registri* #40; ed. Caspar, MGH, Ep. VII, 296.

[47] John VIII, *Ep.* #68; ed. Caspar, MGH, Ep. VII, 62-63.

[48] *Ibid.*, #71, pp. 66-67.

[49] John's conditions are revealed in three letters written in August, 879, to Basil and his sons, to the bishops of the eastern patriarchates, and to Photius; see *ibid.*, #207-209, pp. 173-174, 179, 185-186. For the decisions of the council of Constantinople in 879-880, see Joannes Dominicus Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum Nova et amplissima collectio*, new ed., XVII (Venice, 1762), cols. 373-526.

Boris that Bulgaria now adhered to Rome and that it behooved the king to act.[50] The stony silence that greeted these letters must have demonstrated to John the true situation. Boris had no intention of reestablishing contacts with Rome. The Greeks had been safe in conceding to Rome authority over the Bulgars, since Rome would never be able to capitalize on it. Cultural and political ties oriented the Bulgars toward Constantinople, assuring that Rome would exert small influence. Moreover, subsequent years were to show that the Bulgars were intent on an autocephelous church, built on a Slavic liturgy. Thus the hope of Roman control faded even more completely, leaving the papacy with only the consolation that it had lent an important hand while the Bulgars were being converted.

John inherited another missionary venture from his predecessors. Methodius was carrying on his work in Pannonia and Moravia under papal auspices. John acted as his champion in the face of the difficulties which he encountered in these areas. The gravest problem in connection with Methodius' mission did not result from opposition by pagans. By the time of John's pontificate the Christianization of Pannonia and Moravia had made extensive progress. The chief problem arose out of conflicting claims concerning the organization of new converts, a process that Hadrian II had tried to control by making Methodius an archbishop for a huge area in Pannonia and Moravia. The major obstacle to papal policy in this case was the Bavarian clergy supported by the German crown.

Methodius' initial activities in his new province immediately aroused the opposition of the Bavarian clergy which had interests in Pannonia. The Bavarians claimed the Greek was intruding into their territory and perhaps added the charge that he was a teacher of false doctrines.[51] A Germany military offensive against Moravia, which resulted in the captivity of Rastislav and his replacement by Svatopluk, who was pro-German at the moment, emboldened the Bavarian bishops to act against Methodius.[52] He was captured, put on trial, and sentenced to prison with scant attention paid to serving justice. After he had remained in prison for over two years and had suffered vile treatment, the whole affair came to the attention of John. In May, 873, he acted with decision to free his legate and protect the new Slavic organization. He first wrote letters to Louis the German and his son, Carlomann, to remind them that Pannonia pertained to Roman jurisdiction and that Rome's provisions for its organization must be respected. Strict orders were given to Carlomann to allow Methodius to act freely in Pannonia in order to carry out papal orders.[53] John's action against the Bavarian bishops was more severe. Adalwin, archbishop of Salzburg, was accused of being the author of the plot against Methodius and was ordered to restore him to his see immediately.[54] For their part in the attack on Methodius Emeric of Passau and Anno of Friesing were both deposed of their authority until they made their peace with Rome by making a journey to the papal court.[55] To assure that all complied with his orders John sent a legate, Paul, bishop of Ancona, to Germany with specific instructions as to how to deal with the case. Paul was to remind Louis the German that Pannonia had formerly pertained to Rome and could not be claimed by right of conquest. To Rome alone belonged the right of ordination and deposition of clergy. Paul was also instructed to reprimand the bishops involved and see to it that Methodius was freed. The papal legate was instructed to send Methodius safely on his way to Moravia.[56] Apparently the pope also tried to appease the Germans somewhat after this assault on their claims. He ordered Methodius to abandon the use of the Slavic ritual, a reversal of papal policy that perhaps threatened Methodius' work among the Slavs.[57]

---

[50] John VIII, *Ep.* #298, 308; ed. Caspar, MGH, Ep. VII, 260, 266-267.

[51] *Vie de Méthode*, 9, tr. Dvornik, pp. 388-389, says the quarrel was over jurisdiction. *De conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum libellus*, 14; ed. Wattenbach, MGH, SS. XI, 14, suggests that the German bishops felt that Methodius was guilty of new teachings. John VIII, *Ep.* #201; ed. E. Caspar, MGH, Ep. VII, 160-161, written several years after the clash between Methodius and the Bavarian bishops, implies that the question of the Slavic ritual agitated the bishops.

[52] For the relations between the Germans and the Moravians in this period, see Dümmler, *Geschichte des ostfränkischen Reiches* II, 294, ff.

[53] John VIII, *Fragmenta Registri*, #15-16; ed Caspar, MGH, Ep. VII, 280-281.

[54] *Ibid.*, #20, p. 283.

[55] *Ibid.*, #22, 23, pp. 285-286.

The papal action bore immediate results. Methodius was freed and returned to his work. His actions were largely confined to Moravia after 873. John's order for him to go there after being freed from prison in Germany was perhaps prompted by the fact that Svatopluk had turned against the Germans and regained his independence. Svatopluk's anti-Germanism perhaps inclined him favorably toward Rome's project of an independent Slavic church. Methodius was greeted well in Moravia. He carried on his campaign against paganism and continued his efforts to perfect the Slavic liturgy. Eventually he encountered new trouble, again from the Germanic clergy. New charges of unorthodoxy were brought against him.[58] Svatopluk reported the situation to Rome, expressing concern over the religious welfare of his people and apparently placing considerable trust in Rome's ability to decide such matters. John wrote to the prince in June or July, 879, assuring him that Rome was the proper source of the true religion and ordering the prince to see to it that the Roman faith was observed. He reported his surprise that Methodius was guilty of deviation but added that he was summoning the archbishop to Rome to test his teaching. At the same time John wrote to Methodius and ordered him to Rome, not only to test his orthodoxy but also to inquire into the charge that Methodius had violated papal orders by using the Slavic liturgy.[59]

A year later in June, 880, John reported to Svatopluk again. Methodius had in the interim been in Rome and had been cleared of all charges. He was now being sent back as archbishop of the Moravian church. John also reported that he had consecrated a certain Wiching as bishop of Nitra and suffragan of Methodius. Wiching had apparently been the ringleader in the charges brought against Methodius and a representative of the pro-German faction in Moravia. John was trying to remove the conflicts that were disturbing Moravia. He ordered that Svatopluk send another priest to Rome for consecration as soon as such a step was necessary. The creation of a third bishop in Moravia would make possible the consecration of still other bishops without recourse to outside assistance. John was still promoting and directing the organization of Moravia. All clergy, whatever their rank or nationality, were to be subject to Methodius. Finally, John gave his consent to the use of the Slavic liturgy, assuring Svatopluk that it would be beneficial to his people and that its use was not illegal.[60]

Methodius' troubles were not yet ended. His foes, led by Wiching, again raised doubts of his orthodoxy. They fell back on papal authority by spreading a rumor that they possessed letters from Rome ordering them to drive Methodius out of Moravia as a heretic. Methodius appealed to Rome for vindication. John sent another letter on March 23, 881, assuring Methodius that the archbishop had full papal support. John expressed his certainty of Methodius' orthodoxy and vehemently denied sending letters to Wiching giving him authority to do anything. The archbishop was ordered to put aside his doubts and continue his missionary work. John would summon the case to Rome if further trouble occurred.[61] This papal order apparently settled the case for the remainder of Methodius' life. He is reported to have continued his work in peace.

---

[56] *Ibid.*, #21, pp. 283-285.

[57] John VIII, *Ep.* #201; ed. Caspar, MGH, Ep. VII, 160-161.

[58] *Vie de Méthode*, 10, tr. Dvornik, p. 389.

[59] John VIII, *Ep.* #200-201; ed. Caspar, MGH, Ep. VII, 160-161.

[60] *Ibid.*, #255, pp. 222-224.

[61] *Ibid.*, #276, pp. 243-244; *Vie de Méthode*, 12, tr. Dvornik, p. 390.

John's pontificate ended in December, 882, without further contact with the work of Methodius. There can be little doubt, however, that papal support had been a valuable asset in the face of the opposition aroused by Methodius' revolutionary method and by papal boldness in staking out a territory for his efforts. Papal power sufficed to curb factious clergymen and papal influence aided in swaying lay assistance to support Methodius. John's success in connection with the Slavic mission offset his inability to persuade the Bulgars to complete their Christianization under papal overlordship.

The passing of John and Methodius led almost immediately to a reversal of the course of Christian growth in Moravia. Methodius had selected one of his disciples, Gorazd, as his successor and had left behind a loyal party to carry on his work. Almost immediately Moravia was divided by a struggle between the party of Methodius and the German clergy. The Germans succeeded in winning the support of Svatopluk, a success perhaps partly explained by a restoration of peace between Svatopluk and Arnulf of Germany.[62] The German faction, having gained the confidence of Svatopluk, turned to Rome to seal the victory. Wiching appeared in Rome as the spokesman of the party. Stephen V (885-891) was completely won over. When Wiching left Rome, he bore a papal letter to Svatopluk in which Stephen denounced the party of Methodius. Apparently he was convinced that their teachings were heretical, since he gave Svatopluk instructions concerning the doctrine of the Trinity and fasting regulations. Most significantly, he condemned the use of the Slavic ritual, accusing Methodius of having broken an oath in which he swore to refrain from the use of that liturgy. Stephen probably gave his blessing to Wiching as the new leader of the Moravian church.[63] The pope also sent a legate to Moravia to arrange the affair, giving him authority to instruct the populace in orthodox teachings, to stop the use of the Slavic rite, and to prohibit Gorazd from exercising his office until he appeared in Rome for judgment.[64] Stephen's action spelled the end of Methodius' work. Svotopluk ordered that the adherents of the Greek be driven from their offices, imprisoned, and finally expelled from Moravia. Some of them fled to Bulgaria, where Boris greeted them warmly and enlisted their talents in his program of creating an independent Bulgarian church.[65] Rome thus lost control over these valuable missionaries. There is no evidence that the ecclesiastical party in control of Moravia had further contact with Rome. Perhaps it is safe to assume that Moravia was oriented toward the German church after the disciples of Methodius had been ousted. This is suggested by the fact that the Moravians made an attempt about 900 to regain their ecclesiastical independence and appealed to Rome for aid. John IX (898-900) was party in an attempt to create an archbishop and three bishops for Moravia. This effort resulted in a violent protest from the Bavarian hierarchy which probably prevented its success.[66]

Throughout the closing years of the ninth century the papacy also sought to sustain the Scandinavian mission. Actually, there was little to be accomplished in this area. The deepening hostility between Norsemen and the Christian world virtually eliminated any hope of the conversion of the Scandinavians, as the limited activities of Rimbert and Adalgar, the first two successors of Anskar as archbishop of Hamburg, revealed. Still every effort was made to maintain

---

[62] The main outlines of the struggle for ecclesiastical control in Moravia are given in the biography of one of Methodius' disciples; see *Vita s. Clementis*, 7-10; PG 126, 1208-1213. This account is, in part at least, substantiated by the letters of Pope Stephen V, cited below.

[63] Stephen V, *Epistolae passim collectae* #1; ed. G. Laehr, MGH, Ep. VII, 354-358.

[64] Stephen V, *Fragmenta Registri* #33; ed. E. Caspar, MGH, Ep. VII, 352-353.

[65] *Vita s. Clementis*, 11-29; PG 126, 1213-1232.

[66] *Regesta pontificum romanorum: Germania pontificia* I, ed. Albertus Brachman (Berlin, 1910, ff.), p. 163.

Hamburg as a missionary outpost. Rome tried to aid that effort. Successive archbishops were confirmed in their privileges and granted the pallium. Encouragement was extended to the archbishops to create suffragans and to carry on missionary work. Especially vigorous was the action of Stephen V and Formosus (891-896) to prevent the archbishop of Cologne from recovering the bishopric of Bremen, which had been joined with Hamburg as a means of providing material support for Hamburg's missionary activities. Both of these popes refused to divide the two sees, at least until Hamburg possessed suffragans in the still pagan world to the North. They justified their actions on the grounds that Hamburg was a missionary outpost and needed the support of Bremen. However, the papal action was of little consequence, since there was small opportunity for missionary work from Hamburg, irrespective of its material condition. Moreover, the German bishops were inclined to flout papal orders with impunity; for instance, in 895 a synod at Tribur ordered that Bremen be returned to the jurisdiction of Cologne, in spite of the papal orders cited above, issued between 890 and 892.[67]

The debacle that marked papal missionary efforts in Bulgaria, Moravia, and Scandinavia in the last years of the ninth century were symptomatic of a general decline of western missionary effort at that time. The papacy was fast becoming embroiled in Roman politics and the victim of the feudal chaos engulfing Italy. The Carolingians were no longer masters of the territory which made up Charlemagne's empire and were thus incapable of action against pagans. The new barbarian invasions by the Magyars and the Norsemen not only made missionary work difficult but drove back the Christian frontier, as was the case when the Magyars overran Moravia. The universal debilitation of western Europe at the end of the ninth century makes the year 900 a dividing point in missionary history. A new alignment of forces was necessary to supply the drive for another era of expansion. In the general paralysis that halted the spread of Christianity around 900, perhaps no missionary agency suffered a greater loss of independence of action than did the papacy. Not for a long time would it be able to exert a significant force on missionary affairs in the West. Thus the year 900 marked a definite conclusion of that phase of papal missionary effort that had been inaugurated when Gregory I dispatched his monks to England in 596.

VI.

The evidence presented in the preceding pages suggests certain general statements characterizing the role of the papacy in the expansion of Christianity in the early Middle Ages.

Gregory the Great's policy certainly overshadowed all papal activity for the three following centuries. He struck out boldly along a line that involved papal responsibility for almost every aspect of missionary effort. His program included selecting a missionary field, choosing missionary personnel, defining the objectives of missionaries, rallying Christian society to their support, proposing methods to be used in attacking paganism, supplying guidance to missionaries whenever extraordinary problems arose, organizing the new converts into a church, and glorifying missionary effort as a proper activity for dedicated Christians. No other agency in western society had as yet devised such a comprehensive program for dealing with paganism. Gregory's concept and practice of missionary work thus promised to establish the papacy as the leading agent in expanding the earthly realm of Christ.

---

[67] For the missionary activity among the Scandinavians from the death of Anskar to the end of the ninth century, see *Vita Rimberti*, ed. Waitz, pp. 80-100; Adam of Bremen, *Gesta Hammburgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum* I, 37-52; PL 146, 485-495. For the papal part in trying to protect Hamburg, see Stephen V, *Ep.* #2, 5; ed. Laehr, MGH, Ep. VII, 358-359, 364-365; Formosus, *Ep.* #1-3; ed. G. Laehr, MGH, Ep. VII, 366-370. For the synod at Tribur, see Adam of Bremen I, 51; PL 146, 492-493.

The history of the next three centuries demonstrated that his plan was abortive. Christendom expanded, but the papacy must be eliminated as an important contributor in many phases of missionary activity. The papacy never again took the initiative in the struggle against paganism. No matter how seriously paganism might threaten Christendom or how ripe a pagan people might be for conversion, Rome took no action until some other missionary agency made the initial move and then presented Rome with an opportunity for intervention. The papacy did not make a serious attempt to recruit personnel for missionary work. Occasionally it commanded an Italian cleric to assume at least a temporary responsibility in a missionary field or suggested to a monk that missionary work might befit his urge to serve Christ. Rome had no troop of servants to assign to missionary work during these centuries and thus missionaries had to emerge from other levels of society. The papacy supplied none of the material resources needed to begin and maintain missionary projects. The popes might plead with those who did possess wealth to contribute to the support of missionaries, but its pleas lacked compulsion. The papacy was almost silent on the crucial and troublesome question of the methods to be used in convincing pagans to accept Christianity. Even when the papacy was so deeply immersed in missionary affairs as it was in the case of Boniface, it did little more to define a missionary method than utter a generality about the need for preaching and teaching. The missionary was left to devise his own method or to seek guidance elsewhere than from the papacy. Only occasionally did the papacy condone a particular method being employed by a missionary, and then with some reluctance, as might be illustrated by the papal vacillation on the use of the Slavic liturgy in the later part of the ninth century. The silence of the papacy on missionary method was quite clearly the result of papal ignorance of conditions and problems in most missionary areas.

With papal policy lacking in so many ways, one is compelled to conclude that papal missionary activity over the three centuries under consideration was largely opportunistic. As a rule, the papacy waited to be asked to help in the struggle for converts. In some exceptional cases, a pope might try to exploit a situation presented to him and thus broaden the scope of papal activity beyond the intention of the missionary seeking Rome's help. However, these cases do not contradict the fundamental opportunism of papal policy. The viability of a new Christian establishment depended upon the strength of a Christian ruler backing missionary work or of a newly converted native king or of a dedicated, persistent, and persuasive band of missionary monks, but never on the papacy. Rome could only assist those agencies and usually admitted its limitations by awaiting their request for assistance.

Having severely delimited the extent of papal contribution to early medieval missionary effort, it still needs to be said that Rome cannot be eliminated as a missionary force. As one assault after another was made on paganism, Rome provided a limited but significant share in the victory.

First, the papacy, more consistently and more effectively than any other agency, provided legitimacy to missionary undertaking. A papal letter of commendation for a missionary, a papal bull confirming the activities of a missionary, a papal plea to a pagan king, a papal directive to Christian laymen were almost invariably necessary parts of a successful missionary venture, eagerly sought by anyone engaged in missionary work. In numerous situations Rome alone could speak with authority enough to clear away difficulties. This contribution was especially vital in offsetting conflicts that arose among the several Christian agencies engaged in missionary activity, although it occasionally served to open doors in the pagan world. However a missionary chose to use the papal name, he could almost depend upon it to strengthen his position and to aid him win converts.

Second, the papacy played a major role in impressing on the missionary effort of the early Middle Ages the principle that organization was the most important step in the conversion process. From Gregory I's time onward Rome injected into every missionary venture the idea that the institution of an independent episcopacy must accompany the establishment of the Christian religion in any pagan territory. The popes accomplished this end in many ways. Sometimes they thrust upon missionaries seeking papal aid the episcopal or archiepiscopal rank. They ordered these emissaries to give priority to the creation of new bishoprics. They enthusiastically confirmed the efforts of kings who established episcopal sees in newly converted areas. They encouraged newly converted rulers to think in terms of a speedy division of their realms into bishoprics. They did everything in their power to prevent newly established bishoprics from being phantom organizations, manipulated by power-seeking kings or empire-building ecclesiastics. The importance of this steadfast policy must be judged in the context of an era when other possible modes of treating converts were bidding for supremacy. In her insistence on the institution of an independent episcopacy Rome was competing with the Irish idea of permitting the appealing, dedicated "saint" to form the center of cohesion among new converts, the Benedictine tendency to let the monastery serve as a Christian center, the royal or princely urge to devise an ecclesiastical structure that would serve purely political ends, and the Byzantine custom of creating "national" churches as components of an imperial order. The supremacy of any of these would certainly have changed the ecclesiastical face of Europe and perhaps all other aspects of the emerging western European civilization. At Rome's urging, however, the ancient Roman concept of the organization of newly conquered territories was impressed upon western society in the form of new bishoprics established in even barely Christianized regions. Without papal guidance the conversion process might have resulted in a multiplicity of organizational forms left behind to add to the other particularistic institutions that resulted from the fall of the Roman Empire and the ascendancy of the Germanic barbarians.

Third, Rome performed a vital missionary function by serving as a fountainhead of direction in the transmission of ritual, dogma, and discipline to converts. By its very nature missionary effort confronted western society with unusual complications. Missionary agents of every description turned repeatedly to Rome for instructions on how to handle these problems. Rome always replied with specific guidance, thus arming every missionary agency with authorized and practicable solutions to its immediate problem. Not only did this aid the missionary in his immediate situation, it also tended to unify the religious system transmitted to the pagan world and ease the entrance of pagan people into the main stream of western culture. Again no other agency—with the possible exception of the Carolingian state under Charlemagne—possessed the grasp of the total Christian tradition or the authority to act as a source of guidance to overcome the mountainous problems posed by the meeting of Christianity and paganism.

Finally, as a concomitant to its role as adviser and legislator in the areas of ritual, liturgy, and discipline, the papacy helped immeasurably in keeping Christianity supple and adaptable as it was transmitted to barbarian converts. It is not difficult to find evidence that some missionary agencies tried to pursue a counsel of perfection in imposing the new religion on converts, while others concerned themselves so little with the religious side of the conversion process that there was a danger of complete superficiality. Rome always sought to avoid both extremes. In every possible fashion the papacy sought to restrain the perfectionists by advising a modification of Christianity fitted to the traditions, culture, and mentality of prospective or recent converts. Just as frequently the popes sought to inculcate the idea that conversion must result in a real change of heart and an obvious change of habits for the convert. Perhaps in this intermingling of Christianity and barbarism lay the secret of the vitality of Christianity in this critical era; only its adaptability permitted it to escape the fate of other aspects of Graeco-Roman civilization. The papacy with unceasing consistency advocated a compromise with barbarism and paganism. Thereby it made a major contribution to the shaping of the new civilization and of its most recent additions, the recently converted Germanic and Slavic groups brought into the Christian fold between 590 and 900.

Hugues de Saint-Victor, Auteur d'une *Practica Geometriae*

ROGER BARON

En 1897 M. Curtze publia,[1] d'après le manuscrit *latin* 13021 de Munich, un texte anonyme d'une *Practica geometriae* et montra combien cet opuscule était digne d'intérêt. Mais plus encore que M. Curtze, P. Tannery s'intéressa à ce texte. A plusieurs reprises il y revint: en 1899[2], en 1900[3], en 1901[4], en 1903[5]. Comme il avait reconnu le texte publié par Curtze dans un manuscrit de Cambridge et un manuscrit de la Mazarine, il se proposa même d'en donner une édition.[6] Du moins, il publia une suite du texte absente du manuscrit de Munich.[7] L'ouvrage, en effet, mérite autant d'attention de la part de l'historien des sciences que de la part de l'historien de Saint-Victor. C'est qu'il représente l'état de la science géométrique médiévale avant l'injection de la science arabe.

Voilà pourquoi il n'est pas vain d'essayer de le dater. Et il peut être daté, approximativement au moins, s'il est possible de l'attribuer, pour des raisons valables, à Hugues de Saint-Victor. C'est précisément cette attribution que P. Tannery s'est toujours refusé à admettre,[8] ignorant pratiquement, bien qu'il lui arrive de la citer, la position prise par B. Hauréau qui, dans ses études critiques de l'oeuvre de Hugues de Saint-Victor,[9] ne voyait aucune difficulté à l'authenticité hugonienne de la *Practica geometriae*.

L'opinion de P. Tannery, au contraire de celle d'Hauréau, ne s'est aucunement formée à partir de l'oeuvre de Hugues de Saint-Victor, mais à partir du manuscrit anonyme de Munich, révélé par Curtze. On en suit très facilement les phases de développement. Le texte de Munich est aperçu par P. Tannery dans un manuscrit de Cambridge qui attribue la *Practica* à un certain *Hugo*. P. Tannery pense à un *Hugo physicus*.[10] Puis cet Hugues le médecin ne lui semble pas avoir de chance véritable d'être l'auteur de l'opuscule, et il abandonne l'hypothèse qu'il ne peut vérifier. Il rencontre le même texte dans un manuscrit parisien de la Mazarine qui, observe-t-il lui-même, contient des ouvrages de Hugues de Saint-Victor. Il ne s'arrête pas à cette remarque; et alors, il prend contact avec une partie de l'oeuvre du Victorin, mais c'est pour sentir et faire ressortir les difficultés d'attribution à un même auteur de la *Practica* et du *Didascalicon*, ouvrage certainement authentique de Hugues. En somme, pour P. Tannery, ni la tradition textuelle n'affirme la paternité hugonienne, ni les données de la critique interne n'y sont favorables. C'est en fonction de cette position de P. Tannery que nous allons étudier le problème de l'authenticité de la *Practica geometriae.*

---

[1] *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, VIII (1897), 193-220.

[2] *Bulletin des sciences mathématiques*, XXIII (1899), comptes-rendus et analyses, 140-145. (Texte inséré dans Paul Tannery, *Mémoires scientifiques* V, *Sciences exactes au moyen-âge, 1887-1921* (Toulouse, Paris, 1922), 206-210.

[3] *Compte-rendu à l'Académie des Sciences et Belles-Lettres*, I (1900), 352-353 (*Mém. scient.* V, 317-358).

[4] *Revue de synthèse historique*, II (1901), 297.

[5] *Zeitschrift für Geschichte den mathematischen Wissenschaften* II, 3 (1901), 41-44 (*Mém. scient.* V, 308-313). Préface à l'*Histoire de l'Abbaye royale et de l'Ordre des chanoines réguliers de Saint-Victor de Paris*, par Fourier-Bonnard I, V-XI (Paris, 1903). (*Mém. scient.* V, 314-320).

[6] *Mém. scient.* V, 308.

[7] *Ibid.*, 361-362.

[8] Ainsi que Victor Mortet, *Notice historique sur l'emploi de procédés matériels et d'instruments usités dans la géométrie pratique au moyen-âge* (Extrait des *Comptes-rendus du deuxième congrès international de philosophie* [Genève, 1906], 3, n. 1.)

[9] *Hugues de Saint-Victor. Nouvel essai sur l'examen de ses oeuvres* (Paris, 1859). *L'Oeuvre de Hugues de Saint-Victor* (Paris, 1886).

[10] La *Practica* est encore attribuée à *Hugo physicus* dans A. C. Crombie, *Robert Grossetête and the Origins of Experimental Science 1100-1700* (Oxford, 1955), p. 24.

* * *

Si nous considérons la tradition textuelle, nous constatons que le texte de la *Practica geometriae* nous est fourni par sept manuscrits: quatre manuscrits parisiens, trois de la Bibliothèque nationale[11] et un de la Mazarine;[12] le manuscrit de Munich publié par Curtze;[13] un manuscrit de Cambridge;[14] un manuscrit de Leyde.[15] Il faut immédiatement noter que l'anonymat n'est pas du tout de règle dans cette tradition textuelle. Apparemment, seuls l'*incipit* et l'*explicit* du manuscrit de Cambridge formulent une attribution: *Incipit hic practica hugonis, explicit practica hugonis.* C'est cet Hugo que P. Tannery avait d'abord identifié à *Hugo physicus* qui peut, cependant, parfaitement désigner Hugues de Saint-Victor, si l'on se réfère aux *incipit* d'oeuvres certainement authentiques du Victorin dans nombre de manuscrits. Mais en réalité, il est deux manuscrits parisiens qui sont des témoins de tout premier ordre de l'authenticité hugonienne. Les manuscrits, Mazarine 717, B.N. 14506, de l'ancien fonds de Saint-Victor, sont, en fait, des corpus d'oeuvres de Hugues de Saint-Victor. Il n'est pas exact de dire, même pour le *codex* le plus important, Mazarine 717, que l'on ait affaire à des "receuils d'oeuvres complètes", car il manque des oeuvres ou des parties d'oeuvres importantes. Mais ces *codices*, s'ils pèchent par défaut, ne pèchent pas par excès; non seulement un ouvrage qu'ils renferment est donné comme étant de Hugues de Saint-Victor, mais il y a déjà une forte présomption qu'il puisse être considéré comme tel.[16]

On ne peut tirer une objection du changement d'écriture. A *priori,* on pourrait se dire qu'il était assez normal de recourir à un "spécialiste" en ce début du XIII^e siècle, où le *quadrivium* devenait de plus en plus une spécialité. Mais en fait, il n'y a pas de changement d'écriture en Mazarine *Ms* 717; en B.N. *Ms* 14506, l'écriture particulière n'est pas réservée à la *Practica*, mais employée pour d'autres oeuvres de Hugues.

Il y a donc bien une affirmation importante de l'authenticité hugonienne dans la tradition textuelle. Elle se renforce encore, si l'on mentionne un manuscrit aujourd'hui disparu, mais dont le catalogue d'Erfurt nous a conservé l'*incipit*: Erfurt, *Amploniana* cat-a. 1412, Math. 32: *Practica uenerabilis hugonis in geometria. Venerabilis Hugonis* est une dénomination assez courante de Hugues de Saint-Victor.

* * *

La conclusion à laquelle nous sommes arrivés reçoit un *confirmatur*, d'une valeur singulière, de la liste authentique des oeuvres de Hugues de Saint-Victor. Cette liste, nous la trouvons, non dans les nomenclatures des chroniqueurs, déficientes et pléthoriques à la fois, mais dans la "table des matières" que, peu de temps après la mort de Hugues, fit établir Gilduin, abbé de Saint-Victor, et qui nous est conservée par le Oxford, Merton College *Ms* 49.[17] L'auteur de cet *Indiculum*, s'il ne prétend pas tout retenir des oeuvres de Hugues—et il affirme même qu'il ne retient pas tout—a le souci primordial de ne citer que des ouvrages authentiques. Or, comme dans le Mazarine *Ms* 717, qui a une grande affinité avec l'*Indiculum*, nous trouvons mentionné la "Pratique de Géométrie" avec l'"Abrégé de Philosophie" et la "Grammaire". Il y a une simple différence d'ordre pour les éléments de la trilogie dans le Mazarine *Ms* 717 et dans l'*Indiculum*. Au lieu que celui-ci donne la série *Epitome Dindymi in philosophiam, Grammatica, Practica geometriae*, le *codex* victorin présente: *Practica geometriae, Epitome Dindimi in philosophiam, De Grammatica*. Mais il est clair que l'affirmation substantielle est la même.

---

[11] *Mss* B.N. 7185 (XIII^e siècle), B.N. 14506 (XIII^e s.), B.N. 15362 (XIII^e s.).

[12] Mazarine *Ms.* 717 (XIII^e s.).

[13] *Ms* Clm 13021 (XII^e s.).

[14] Gonville and Caius College *Ms* 413 (XII^e s.).

[15] *Ms. Gronov* 21 (XII^e s.) et non pas *Gron.* 23, comme le dit J. de Ghellinck, "La Table des matières de la première édition des oeuvres de H. de S.V.," *Rech. de sc. relig.*, I (1910), 286, à la suite de Bubnov, *Gerberti opera mathematica* (Berolini, 1899), p. 47.

[16] Sur les deux manuscrits, Mazarine 717, B.N. 14506, cf. notre introduction (ch. I) à *Science et sagesse chez Hugues de Saint-Victor*, à paraître prochainement.

[17] Cette table des matières a été éditée et analysée avec un soin extrême par J. de Ghellinck, *art. cit.*, 270-289, 385-396.

Le *codex* et l'*Indiculum* sont de nouveau d'accord sur la teneur du texte. Le scribe de l'*Indiculum* a pris soin, en effet, d'indiquer les *incipit* et les *explicit* des ouvrages mentionnés. Or, la mention de l'*explicit* pour la *Practica* permet de résoudre un problème d'intégrité, car nous trouvons dans les manuscrits des textes de longueur différente. Par ordre de longueur décroissante, nous avons:

Maz. 717: Sed si que alia de horizonte dicenda uidebuntur sequenti libro
B.N. 14506: *Expl.* cum parallelis et coluris aliisque celestibus circulis reser-
B.N. 15362: uamus.

B.N. 7185: *Expl.* contrahit repectum in unam lineam sicut est hoc.

Clm. 13021: *Expl.* dispositis cathetis ad eamdem basim hypotenuse non concurrent.

Gonv. et Caius
C. 413: *Expl.* maior duplo et sit figura talis.
Leyde, *Gron.* 21.[18]

L'*explicit* de l'*Indiculum* coïncide avec celui du texte le plus long représenté par Mazarine *Ms* 717, B.N. *Mss* 14506 et 15362. Nous avons là une vérification de l'intuition de P. Tannery, publiant le surplus de Mazarine *Ms* 717, jugé sans hésitation la suite normale du texte tronqué de *Ms* Clm. 13021, et reconstituant ainsi intégralement la *Practica geometriae*. L'auteur de cette oeuvre entière serait bien, à s'en tenir à la tradition textuelle, Hugues de Saint-Victor.

* * *

Mais les données de la critique interne s'accordent-elles avec cette conclusion? C'est dans le contenu même de l'oeuvre que P. Tannery a rencontré, pour l'affirmation de l'authenticité hugonienne, des difficultés qu'il a estimées insurmontables. Le fait est qu'à juger Hugues de Saint-Victor par ce que l'on croit être sa dominante la plus apparente, on peut s'étonner que ce mystique se soit intéressé à des objets si divers. Et si l'on constate dans son oeuvre des pôles d'intérêts variés, on peut encore hésiter à admettre qu'il ait vraiment cru nécessaire de devenir l'auteur d'une Géométrie.

P. Tannery a formulé l'objection avec beaucoup plus de précision. Il a lu dans une oeuvre de Hugues, le *Didascalicon*, le terme *practica*, et constaté que son sens est tout autre que dans la *Practica geometriae.*[19] Il a lu aussi dans le même ouvrage la définition de la *cosmimetria* et observé qu'une autre notion en est donnée dans la *Practica.*[20]

---

[18] Le manuscrit de Leyde fait suivre immédiatement la *Practica geometriae* (fols. 46^r-54), après quelques postilles d'ordre astronomique cependant, d'un traité *De Constellationibus*. N'aurait-on pas affaire au traité d'Astronomie de Hugues de Saint-Victor, considéré comme perdu et jusqu'ici jamais retrouvé? Il faut vite réduire l'illusion. Il s'agit du livre III de l'astronomie de Hygin — igitur incipiemus a polo boreo—ainsi que l'indique très exactement le Catalogue de Leyde. Par contre ce catalogue, au fol. 41, annonce à la fois: theoria et practica geometriae, et donne comme *initium*: practicam geometriae. . . . Quant au traité d'Astronomie, il est bien annoncé par la finale de la *Practica*: sequenti libro . . . reseruamus (cf. *l'explicit* de Mazarine *Ms* 717). Mais on n'a aucune preuve que le projet fut réalisé. Mieux vaut garder, cependant, l'hypothèse de recherche. Pour le livre III de l'Astronomie de Hygin, il était assez naturel de le mettre à la suite de la Cosmimétrie de la *Practica*. Dans le *Didascalicon*, Hugues a montré les rapports étroits entre cosmimétrie et astronomie (grandeur immobile d'un côté, grandeur mobile de l'autre, *Didascalicon* 2, 14). Le copiste, d'ailleurs, commence déjà à la fin de la *Practica* d'inscrire en marge les représentations graphiques des constellations, qui devaient plus tard prendre une si grande importance, sur fond de figures mythologiques, Cf., par exemple, C. Julii Hygini, *Fabularum liber ejusdem poeticon astronomicon libri quatuor* (Parisiis, 1678).

Mettons d'abord en relief cette double difficulté, en confrontant les textes en litige. En ce qui concerne *practica*, le *Didascalicon* nous offre cette définition au chapitre de la division de la philosophie:

> Philosophia dividitur in theoricam, practicam, mechanicam et logicam. Hae quatuor omnem continent scientiam. Theorica interpretatur speculativa; practica, activa, quam alio nomine ethicam, id est moralem, dicunt eo quod mores in bona actione consistant. (*Didasc.* 2, 1; PL 176, 752B; éd. Buttimer,[21] p. 24, ll. 20-24).

La *Practica geometriae*, ainsi dénommée non par un titre surajouté, mais par les premiers mots de la première phrase, nous présente une autre définition du même terme en opposant la théorie et la pratique de la géométrie:

> . . . omnis geometrica disciplina aut theorica est, id est speculativa, aut practica, id est activa. Theorica siquidem est, que spacia et intervalla dimensionum rationabilium sola rationis speculatione investigat; practica vero est, que quibusdam instrumentis agitur et ex aliis alia proportionaliter coniiciendo diiudicat. (Maz. *Ms* 717, fol. 41^{rb}; *Ms* Clm. 13021, fol. 202^{vb}).[20]

Quant à la *cosmimetria*, voici ce qu'en dit le *Didascalicon*:

> Cosmos mundus interpretatur, et inde dicta est cosmimetria, id est, mensura mundi. Haec metitur sphaerica, id est, globosa et rotunda, sicut est pila et ovum, unde etiam a sphaera mundi propter excellentiam dicta est cosmimetria non quia tantum de mundi mensura agat, sed quia mundi sphaera inter omnia sphaerica dignior sit. (2, 13; PL 176, 757B; éd. Buttimer, p. 33, ll. 24-29).

Et la *Practica geometriae*:

> Cosmus enim grece mundus dicitur, et inde cosmimetria dicta est quasi mensura mundi, ea videlicet, que circumferentiam metitur, quam in ambitu celestis sphaere et reliquorum circulorum celestium . . . consideramus. (Maz. *Ms* 717, fol. 41^{rb}, *Ms* Clm. 13021, fol. 202^{vb}).

Ne semble-t-il pas qu'il faille tirer la conclusion: autre l'auteur qui voit dans la pratique, l'éthique ou la morale, autre celui qui se sert du terme "pratique" pour désigner la géométrie appliquée; autre celui qui fait de la cosmimétrie la mesure de toute sphère, autre celui qui en restreint le sens à la mesure de la sphère céleste?[22]

* * *

Il ne peut être question de nier les deux sens de *practica*. On pourrait être tenté d'abord de noter que Hugues s'est servi de l'expression *practica geometriae* comme d'une expression empruntée à la source qu'il utilisait. Ainsi trouvons-nous dans le *Didascalicon* (éd. Buttimer, p. 18, l. 3) le terme *archetypus* qui n'est certes pas un terme hugonien, et dans la *Practica geometriae*, les notions de *triangulus oxygonius* et *triangulus amblygonius* et plusieurs autres empruntées à la *Geometria Gerberti*, celle de *mediclinium*, tirée de la *Geometria incerti auctoris*, celle d'*alhidada* extraite du *Liber de astrolabio*,[23] celle d'*horoscopus* employée par ces deux derniers ouvrages, le terme d'*epiphania* comme équivalent de *superficies*, connu de Macrobe comme de Martianus Capella. Mais précisément

---

[19] *Mém. scient.* V, 319-320.

[20] *Ibid.*, 320.

[21] Edition Buttimer (Washington, 1939).

[22] Cf. Préface à Fourier-Bonard, *Histoire . . . de Saint-Victor*, IX-X.

[23] Ces trois oeuvres sont éditées par N. Bubnov, *Gerberti opera mathematica* (Berolini, 1899).

practica geometriae ne se rencontre pas dans ces sources de Hugues qui nous sont connues: l'Index de Bubnov sur ce point reste muet.

Il est cependant nécessaire de se souvenir de l'aspect mouvant du vocabulaire hugonien et des variations d'éclairage qui reçoit un même terme. *Theologus* et *theologia* n'ont pas le même sens dans le *Didascalicon* et l'*In Hierarchiam.* Dans lê meme chapitre I de l'*In Ecclesiasten*, *meditatio* et *contemplatio* voient leur signification changer quelque peu. *Historia* se prent en plusieurs acceptions, et de même *allegoria.* Ce dernier exemple est même spécialement instructif. L'*allegoria* du *lector artium* définie par le *De Grammatica* semble très loin de l'*allegoria* du *lector sacer*, définie par le *De Scripturis* et le *Didascalicon,* encore qu'il y ait un point commun (une chose en signifie une autre). Or de même que Hugues grammairien et Hugues exégète et théologien se servent du même mot *allegoria*, avec un contenu différent, ainsi Hugues "scientifique" et Hugues "philosophe" emploient le même terme *practica* avec une double signification. Il y a d'ailleurs ici aussi un point commun que les textes cités plus haut mettent en évidence: dans les deux cas, s'il s'agisse de la division de la philosophie ou de la division de la géométrie, *practica* est opposée à *theorica,* et dans les deux cas, *practica* a pour synonyme *activa* et *theorica* pour équivalent *speculativa.*

Cette constatation incline déjà à croire que l'on a affaire au même auteur. Une nouvelle réflexion nous confirme dans ce sentiment. Quoiqu'il en soit de la source spéciale possible, relative au domaine scientifique, des termes *theorica* et *practica*, Hugues leur a donné une importance et un lustre en parfaite conformité avec son génie. Ce génie est spontanément tourné vers la saisie des rapports de correspondance, et d'autre part, aime s'appuyer sur les données traditionnelles pour y ajouter. Hugues sait que parler de théorique, c'est parler de contemplation de vérité, et que parler de pratique, c'est parler d'application à la vie d'une vision de l'esprit. Aussi bien que de philosophie théorique et de philosophie pratique, il traite de géométrie théorique et de géométrie pratique. Et somme toute, la géométrie pratique est à la géométrie théorique ce que la philosophie pratique est à la philosophie théorique.

Practica, d'ailleurs, était courant dans le vocabulaire médiéval avec le sens d'*effectis* (cf. Du Cange). Le relief que Hugues confère à ce terme fait songer à celui qu'il a donné à *mechanica.* Le mot *mechanica,* bien connu avant lui, finit à la suite de la promotion qu'il lui accorde, par désigner une des quatre branches de la philosophie, tout comme *logica, theorica, practica.* De même, le terme *practica*, bien connu, lui aussi, signifie une division de la géométrie.

Il est une dernière remarque qui rend cette conclusion encore plus plausible. L'opuscule de géométrie fait partie d'une trilogie: *Epitome in philosophiam, Grammatica, Practica geometriae.* Or, dans l'*Epitome*, le terme consacré pour nommer la morale, ce n'est pas *practica*, mais *ethica.* C'est dans le *Didascalicon*, postérieur à l'*Epitome* (puisqu'il implique une synthèse de l'*Epitome* et du *De Scripturis*), que *practica* supplante *ethica.* Donc, sur le plan de la simple culture des arts—peut-être faut-il dire: au premier moment du développement de l'activité intellectuelle de Hugues—*ethica* désigne la morale et *practica* concerne la géométrie appliquée.

Faut-il ajouter que *practica geometriae* a pu être suggérée à Hugues par *theorica geometriae*? C'est plutôt l'hypothèse inverse qu'il faut faire en se référant à Bubnov.[24] Si la *Gerberti isagoge geometriae*, sans titre dans les manuscrits du XIV^e siècle, est parfois nommée au XII^e siècle *theorica geometriae,* c'est parce que dans le Leyde, *Ms Gronov* 21, elle est jointe à notre *Practica geometriae.*

* * *

Si maintenant nous nous tournons vers la *cosmimetria*, nous observons une oscillation analogue de vocabulaire, mais avec une amplitude moindre. En fait, nous ne constatons qu'une dilatation de sens pour un même terme, et nous restons dans la même sphère d'idées, quand nous passons de la cosmimétrie, mesure de la sphère céleste, à la cosmimétrie, mesure de toute sphère. Ce sont des exemples semblables de dilatation de sens que nous offrent les termes déjà cités de *contemplatio* et de *theologia*. Mais il y a plus. Nous ne trouvons en réalité qu'une différence d'accent dans les deux notions de la cosmimétrie insérées dans la *Practica geometriae* et le *Didascalicon*. Si le *Didascalicon* voit dans la cosmimétrie la discipline qui a pour objet la mesure de toute sphère, il ajoute que c'est par une dénomination *a posteriori* qu'elle reçoit son nom de cosmimétrie. Mais d'autre part, si la *Practica geometriae* fait d'abord de la cosmimétrie la mesure de la sphère céleste, elle ajoute que son objet ne s'y réduit pas. C'est ce que dit le texte que nous n'avons cité plus haut qu'en partie, pour mieux faire saillir l'objection de P. Tannery:

---

[24] *Ed. cit.*, pp. 47-48.

> Ea videlicet, que circumferentiam metitur, quam in ambitu celestis sphaere et reliquorum circulorum celestium, nec non in globo terre, multorum etiam aliorum, que natura in orbem disposuit, consideramus (Maz. *Ms* 717, fol. 41^{rb}; *Ms* Clm. 13021, fol. 202^{vb}).

* * *

C'est un *confirmatur* de l'authenticité hugonienne que présentent les notions d'altimétrie et de planimétrie, mentionnées conjointement à celle de cosmimétrie, pour former la triade géométrique. Voici le *Didascalicon:*

> Planimetria, planum metitur, id est, longum et latum, et extenditur ante et retro, dextrorsum et sinistrorsum. Altimetria altum metitur, et extenditur sursum et deorsum. Nam et mare altum dicitur, id est profundum; et arbor alta, id est sublimis. (*Didasc.* 2, 14; PL 176, 757A; éd. Buttimer, p. 33, ll. 20-23).

Et la *Practica geometriae*:

> Et ad altimetriam quidem pertinet ea porrectio, que sursum et deorsum fit; ad planimetriam autem illa, que fit ante et retro, dextrorsum sive sinistrorsum. (Maz. *Ms* 717, *Ms* Clm. 13021, *loc. cit.*).

On voit que si l'ordre est différent, les définitions sont identiques. La *Practica* ajoute même un développement—prolixe, si on le compare au texte concis du *Didascalicon*—pour justifier les notions données. Pour l'altimétrie, elle souligne aussi l'ambiguité de *altum*, équivalent à la fois de *sublime* et de *profundum*, en précisant de plus que ces deux notions peuvent se confondre: . . . *celum profundum dicere solumus.* Et ceci encore est un indice de la discrète subtilité littéraire du Victorin. Pour la planimétrie, si elle est ainsi nommée d'après le *Practica*, c'est bien aussi que *porrectionem secundum planum persequitur.*

* * *

Jusqu'ici en confrontant des textes d'origine latine,[25] le *Didascalicon* et la *Practica geometriae* d'abord, puis la *Geometria Gerberti*, la *Geometria incerti auctoris*, le *Liber de astrolabio*, l'*In Somnium Scipionis*, nous avons conclu que rien ne s'oppose à ce qu'un même auteur ait composé les deux premiers ouvrages. Mais nous n'avons pas mentionné d'ouvrages d'origine arabe. Or, c'est cette dernière suggestion qui fut faite à P. Tannery par L. Baur: "Un érudit allemand, le Dr. Ludwig Baur, m'informait que la division de la *geometria* en *theorica* et *practica*, ainsi que la subdivision sus-mentionnée de la *practica* se trouvent chez le philosophe arabe Al-Farabi, dans un ouvrage qui fut vulgarisé en Occident au cours du 12ᵉ siècle".[26] Nous n'avons aucune référence, mais il est bien probable qu'une piste intéressante nous est indiquée.

---

[25] Bien que nous n'ayons pas en vue ici un travail lexicographique, signalons que *practica*, au sens qui nous occupe, semble bien rare dans ces textes. Le *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens* par A. Blaise (Strasbourg, 1954) cite *practica* au sens de vie morale, de conduite. De même Forcellini et Freud. M. J. Lefevre, secrétaire du *Dictionnaire de latin médiéval*, a l'amabilité de nous dire qu'il ne l'a pas rencontré, au sens que nous considérons, avant le XII^{e} siècle. Nous en restons au sens de vie morale ou de science de la vie morale. Toutes les références que donne Bubnov concernent notre texte, sauf une seule: Vatican, *Ms.* 4539: practice quedam geometrie ad multa dimetienda; mais ce manuscript est du XVII^{e} siècle.

Al-Farabi est l'auteur de deux ouvrages, entre autres, qui nous intéressent spécialement: le *De Scientiis* et le *De Ortu scientiarum.* Deux traductions de l'arabe en latin sont bien connues: celle de Gundissalvi en 1140, celle de Gérard de Crémone en 1230.[27]

Al-Farabi a-t-il influencé Hugues? Même en ce qui concerne les questions méthodologiques et épistémologiques, les deux esprits sont très différents. Hugues, il est vrai, au point de vue de l'essence et de la valeur de la science, pretend bien faisant écho à Platon, et préludant à la pensée cartésienne, que la science est rationnelle, avant d'être expérimentale; c'est ce qu'affirme ce curieux passage du *Didascalicon:*

> Quia enim logica et mathematica priores sunt ordine discendi quam physica, et ad eam quodam modo instrumenti vice funguntur quibus unumquemque primum informari oportet antequam physicae speculationi operam det, necesse fuit ut *non in actibus rerum, ubi fallax experimentum est, sed in sola ratione, ubi inconcussa veritas manet,* suam considerationem ponerent, deinde ipsa ratione praevia ad experientiam rerum descenderent (*Didasc.* 2, 17; PL 176, 758D; éd. Buttimer, p. 36, ll. 20-25).

Mais au point de vue de l'origine, il maintient que toute science vient de l'experience: *omnes enim scientiae prius erant in usu quam in arte* (*Didasc.* 1, 11; PL 176, 750A; éd. Buttimer, p. 21, ll. 12-13). Cette origine des sciences, Al-Farabi la conçoit d'une tout autre façon. A la manière spinoziste, avant la lettre, il annonce: *quomodo ortae sunt omnes scientiae ex substantia et accidente et quomodo coeperunt esse per illa, demonstrabo.*[28] Et il suffit de lire le *De Ortu scientiarum* et le *De Scientiis* après l'*Epitome in philosophiam* et le *Didascalicon* pour constater que l'on passe d'un mode de pensée à un autre tout à fait différent.

Mais de ce que l'essentiel de leur pensée distingue Al-Farabi et Hugues de Saint-Victor, il ne suit pas que le premier n'ait pu inspirer le second pour certaines notions ou pour la terminologie. Avant même de le savoir, notons que la certitude de l'influence du *De Ortu scientiarum* ou du *De Scientiis* sur la *Practica* ne ferait pas échec à l'affirmation de l'authenticité hugonienne de celle-ci, la traduction latine étant de 1140 et Hugues étant mort en 1141. Nous savons que dans les dernières années de sa vie, il travaillait à la composition de son grand ouvrage de théologie, le *De Sacramentis.* Mais ce n'est pas une raison pour qu'il n'ait pu élaborer notre petit opuscule géométrique; d'autant que dans le Prologue du *De Sacramentis,* il mentionne explicitement la géométrie parmi les études propédentiques. (*De Sacramentis,* Prol., 6; PL 176, 185C).[29] Il faut remarquer cependant que dans ce cas, le temps nécessaire à la diffusion de la traduction latine serait relativement court. Aussi la question se pose-t-elle: l'étude des rapports de la *Practica* et de la traduction latine nous interdit-elle de reporter à une date antérieure à 1140 la composition de la *Practica geometriae*?

---

[26] *Mém. scient.* V, 320.

[27] Cf. D. Salmon, "The Mediaeval Latin Translations of Al Farabi's Works", *New Scholasticism,* (1939), 245-261.

[28] Cl. Bäumker, *Alfarabi. Ueber den Ursprung der Wissenschaften (De Ortu scientiarum), Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* XIX, 3 (Münster i. W., 1916), 17.

[29] On pourrait être étonné que la geométrie soit présentée comme si nécessaire à l'étude de l'Ecriture Sainte. La raison en est évidemment qu'elle contribue à la formation générale de l'esprit; mais, de plus, il y a des cas d'exégèse où il lui est fait explicitement appel: ainsi Hugues dans le *De Arca* n'admet pas le diagramme supposé par la description qu'Origène fait de l'arche, parce que l'équilibre de la construction serait impossible.

Nous n'avons rien à retenir du *De Ortu scientiarum*. Examinons le *De Scientiis*, en nous référant aux deux traductions latines. Nous citons la première traduction dans le texte de Camerarius, le seul texte édité, que M. Gonzalez Palencia a réédité,[30] et la seconde dans le texte du Paris, B.N. *Ms latin* 9335, fols. 143-151, édité par M. Palencia.[31]

En premier lieu, on constate que la dyade, *theorica-practica*, ne se trouve dans aucun de ces deux textes concernant la géométrie. On l'aperçoit dans l'article concernant l'arithmétique de la première traduction latine (p. 97); mais elle est absente de la seconde qui se sert seulement de la dyade *activa-speculativa* (p. 145). En second lieu, on constate que la trichotomie de la *geometria activa* est présentée seulement par la première traduction sous la forme *altimetria-planimetria-profundimetria.*

Or, du deuxieme texte, *Liber Alfarabii de Scientiis, tr. a magistro Girardo Cremonensi, de arabico in latinum* (le B.N. *Ms* 9335), M. Gonzalez Palencia n'hésite pas à écrire: *El texto de esta version es completo y corresponde perfectamente con el texto arabe.*[32] Voilà qui pose au moins des questions de transmission de texte.

Mais restons-en au présupposé qu'il faut chercher une origine arabe aux expressions *theorica-practica, altimetria, planimetria, cosmimetria,* et laissons surgir cette hypothèse: Hugues lui-même n'aurait-il pu transposer quelques notions d'arabe en latin. D'une part, on sait qu'il n'hésitait pas à s'informer près de l'Ecole juive rationaliste du Nord de la France;[33] n'avait-il pas une connaissance très élémentaire de l'arabe comme il avait une connaissance élémentaire de l'hébreu? D'autre part, il était en relation avec un certain Jean d'Espagne, à qui il adressa une lettre que nous avons conservée, et par qui il pouvait peut-être facilement se procurer d'utiles renseignements.

Nous ne retiendrons pas la connaissance trop problématique de l'arabe que pouvait avoir Hugues; rien à notre connaissance dans son oeuvre ne vient étayer une hypothèse aussi fantaisiste. Quant à Jean d'Espagne, correspondant de Hugues, on ne peut se permettre de le confondre avec le traducteur Jean de Tolède.[34]

Mais le fait des relations de Hugues avec l'Espagne est à souligner. Il y eut d'ailleurs, au XI^e^ siècle, une première vague d'apport arabe en Occident, beaucoup moins puissante que la deuxième, rénovatrice et transformatrice, de la seconde partie du XII^e^ siècle. C'est à la première que l'on doit les notions d'astrolabe, d'*alhidada*. Peut-être lui est-on redevable encore de ces notions de *theorica* et *practica geometriae*, d'*altimetria*, de *planimetria*, sans oublier celle de *cosmimetria.*[35]

De cette dernière, il n'a pas été question dans les ouvrages d'Al-Farabi, et quant P. Tannery la fait intervenir à propos de ces textes, on peut se demander si la communication de L. Baur a été suffisamment complète. C'est D. Gundissalvi qui parle de *cosmimetria*. Mais il faut distinguer l'activité intellectuelle de Gundissalvi traducteur du *De Scientiis* et du *De Ortu scientiarum* d'Al-Farabi, et celle de Gundissalvi auteur de ses propres ouvrages, le *De Ortu philosophiae* et le *De Divisione philosophiae*. Or, Gundissalvi, auteur, s'inspire d'Al-Farabi qu'il a traduit, mais il ne fait aucune doute qu'il s'inspire aussi de certaines oeuvres de Hugues de Saint-Victor.[36] S'inspire-t-il également de la *Practica* et du *Didascalicon*? C'est probable. Au chapitre *De Geometria* du *De Divisione philosophiae*, il fait un long parallèle de la *theorica* et de la *practica geometriae* et il énumère les espèces de la *practica*: *altimetria, planimetria, cosmimetria*:

---

[30] *Alpharabii vetustissimi Aristotelis interpretis opera omnia quae, latina lingua conscripta, reperiri potuerunt, ex antiquissimis manuscriptis eruta, studio et opera Guilielmi Camerarii* (Parisiis MDCXXXVIII), dans Angel Gonzalez Palencia, *Alfarabi, Catalogo de las ciencias. Edicion y traduccion castellana* (Madrid, 1932), pp. 83-115.

[31] A. Gonzalez Palencio, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-176.

[32] *Op. cit.*, p. XIII.

[33] Voir références dans le chapitre III de notre *Science et Sagesse chez Hugues de Saint-Victor* à apparaître prochainement.

[34] Dont on a même fait le traducteur possible du *De Scientiis* (A. Gonzalez Palencia, *op. cit.*, p. XII).

[35] Notions qui n'ont pas été retenues, cependant, dans les oeuvres du Ps. Gerbert.

> Scientia enim, qua considerat lineas superficies et corpora in altum, altimetria dicitur, scilicet sciencia de mensura altitudinis; qua vero in planum, dicitur planimetria, id est, sciencia de mensura alicuius planiciei; qua vero in profundum, dicitur cosmimetria quasi sciencia de mensura solidi.[37]

Nous avons cette fois *cosmimetria*, terme identique à celui de Hugues, idée rappelant celle d'un passage inséré dans une oeuvre d'Al-Farabi.

On peut donc se demander si l'on ne doit pas à Gundissalvi l'équivalence des termes arabes à *theorica* et *practica*, si même il n'en est pas venu là sous l'influence de Hugues, qui, de son côté, a pu subir une autre influence.[38]

Au cours de l'exploration des sources possibles d'origine arabe à en visager pour certaines notions de la *Practica*, nous avons été conduit à poser plusieurs points d'interrogation. Mais il en est un que nous n'avons nullement été contraint de mettre: c'est celui qui suivrait l'affirmation de l'authenticité hugonnienne de la *Practica*.

* * *

Continuer notre examen de l'ouvrage nous convaincra davantage encore de la présence de Hugues. *Practicam geometriae nostris tradere conatus sum . . . vetera colligens dissipata*, commence l'auteur. Un tel exorde trahit déjà *magister Hugo*. Hugues est le grand promoteur et défenseur de la culture générale, et celle-ci implique une formation "scientifique"—combien élémentaire certes—comme une formation littéraire. Et l'"Art de se cultiver" qu'est le *Didascalicon* demande que l'on ne sacrifie rien de tout ce qui est nécessaire à l'esprit et met en garde contre la tentation de brûler les étapes, à laquelle devaient succomber des esprits aussi distingués qu'Abélard et Jean de Salisbury, négligeant la mathématique. Quant au souci de *vetera dissipata colligere*, il nous fait encore reconnaître le Victorin, constamment porté dans ses divers ouvrages à puiser à de nombreuses sources. Le fait est significatif qu'après s'être inspiré de Gerbert et du Pseudo-Gerbert (*Geometria incerti auctoris, Liber de astrolabio*) dans ses développements sur l'altimétrie et la planimétrie, il demande à Macrobe de le guider dans son exposé sur la cosmimétrie. Macrobe est un auteur à qui il emprunte beaucoup. Il met à contribution son *Commentaire du Songe de Scipion* dans le *Didascalicon*, et aussi bien dans le *De Contemplatione*. Il commente à sa façon son tableau des vertus.[39] Rien d'étonnant qu'attirée successivement par les divers centres d'intérêt du célèbre ouvrage, sa curiosité multiforme y ait trouvé des éléments d'information pour la cosmimétrie.

Ses sources, Hugues les ultilise, à l'ordinaire en les dominant. Il est moins personnel, il est vrai, dans la *Practica* que dans ses autres ouvrages. Pourtant cette oeuvre aussi porte sa marque. Nous y rencontrons comme ailleurs des formules de style oral; nous y apercevons surtout, dans la structure, l'ordonnance, la présentation, l'empreinte d'un esprit aussi méthodique que curieux. P. Tannery ne s'y est pas trompé, disant de l'auteur de la *Practica geometriae*: C'est un "esprit méthodique qui se rend bien compte de ce qu'il enseigne, et qui indique avec soin tout ce qui est essentiel. A cet égard, son écrit tranche singulièrement sur les oeuvres similaires du Moyen-Age".[40] On ne saurait mieux dire; mais on ne saurait non plus porter jugement plus juste sur Hugues de Saint-Victor.

---

[36] Cf. notre "Influence de Hugues de Saint-Victor", *Rech. de théol. anc. et médiév.*, (1955, 1.

[37] L. Baur, *Dominicus Gundissalinus, De Divisione philosophiae, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* IV, 2-3 (Münster i. W., 1903), 108.

[38] Il est curieux de constater que M. A. Gonzalez Palencia, après avoir loué la parfaite exactitude du traducteur latin Gerard de Crémone, qui nous l'avons vu, n'emploie pas les termes *theoria* et *practica* nous donne ensuite cette traduction, sur l'arabe, du passage que nous avons cité plus haut dans la deuxième traduction latine: la ciencia designada con esta palabra es de dos classes: geometria practica y geometria teorica. La geometria practica estudia lineas y superficies (*op. cit.*, p. 40). Où l'on voit que la tendance spontanée est de substituer à *activa practica et* à *passiva* ou *speculativa theorica*.

[39] Cf. notre édition du *De Contemplatione* et notre etude "A propos des ramifications des vertus morales au XII^{e} siècle", *Rech. de théol. anc. et médiév.*, (1955), (à paraître).

* * *

En définitive, l'authenticité hugonienne de la *Practica geometriae* paraît bien être le point de convergence de plusieurs lignes de recherche. Les affirmations explicites et de tout premier ordre de la tradition textuelle, le *confirmatur* des données de la critique interne suffisent, croyons-nous, à lever les doutes et à faire taire les scrupules devant lesquels, au terme de son analyse d'une si parfaite probité, s'arrêtait encore P. Tannery. Mais si Hugues est cet auteur, on peut du même coup fixer un *terminus ad quem* pour la date de composition de l'ouvrage. Car nous connaissons—c'est même une des rares dates concernant Hugues, pour ne pas dire la seule, qui soit parvenue jusqu'à nous—la date de sa mort, à savoir le 11 février, 1141.

Peut-on essayer de proposer une nouvelle approximation? Ce n'est pas facile, car les repères manquent. Il est loisible cependant de remarquer que le *Didascalicon* a précédé les deux grandes oeuvres du *De Sacramentis* et de l'*Hierarchiam coelestem*, qui sont de la fin de la vie de Hugues, et suivi l'*Epitome* dont l'essentiel remanié devait entrer, par la suite, dans une plus vaste synthèse, que le *Didascalicon* lui-même devait présenter. Si l'on fait la *Practica geometriae* contemporaine de l'*Epitome* comme le *De Grammatica*—ce qui est, en somme, assez normal, puisque les trois oeuvres ressortissent à la culture du *lector artium* et constituent une propédentique—on peut situer la *Practica* comme les deux autres éléments de la trilogie vers les années 1125-30.

* * *

Plus importante que la souci d'apporter une nouvelle précision pour déterminer la date de composition de la *Practica* est la certitude à acquérir de la possibilité de reculer cette date dans la première moitié du XII^e^ siècle. Mais sur ce point, impossible d'avoir un meilleur guide que P. Tannery lui-même. Il a mis en relief le caractère élémentaire de la *Practica* et signalé en particulier qu'en elle on ne trouve "aucune teinture de science arabe",[41] aucune trace du moins de cette injection qui devait transformr la science occidentale. Or, à ce point de vue, il est bien plus facile d'attribuer la *Practica* à Hugues, avant 1140 ou 1130, que de l'accorder à *Hugo physicus* ou à quelque autre, en la reportant dans la seconde moitié du XII^e^ siècle, après l'intervention et la diffusion d'influence des interprètes de la science arabe. C'est ainsi qu'en étudiant au sujet de la *Practica* la double question de l'authenticité et de la date de composition, nous restons fidèle à l'essentiel de l'étude de P. Tannery.

---

[40] *Mém. scient.* V, 206.

[41] *Ibid.*, 205.

Chaucer's Mediaeval World outside of Great Britain

FRANCIS P. MAGOUN, JR.

FOREWORD

THE present paper is the last of a series of three and completes a survey and analysis of the geographical and ethnic names used by Geoffrey Chaucer. I have here also included a few words of geographical origin such as *chalon*, *cordewane*, and *jane*, though used by Chaucer without geographical connotation; more for fun than anything else I have included in an outsize entry *brasile*, a word not of geographical origin or meaning and not applied to the country of Brazil until a good century after Chaucer's death. The first paper of this series, "Chaucer's Ancient and Biblical World," appeared in *Mediaeval Studies*, XV (1953), 107-36; the second, "Chaucer's Great Britain," *ibid.*, XVI (1954), 131-51, with addenda and corrigenda to the first paper on pp. 152-56.

The arrangement and presentation here is that used in the two earlier papers; *y* is regularly alphabeted with *i*. Among the names in "Chaucer's Ancient and Biblical World" were a certain number, for example *Rome*, which, so to speak, survived antiquity and appear in Chaucer as mediaeval places as well as ancient. To avoid distributing these—with resulting repetitions—among more than one paper, I dealt with the complete history of the name in the first paper; in such cases I have here entered the name with a reference to its listing in the earlier paper.

The present names are geographically widely dispersed and range from the Baltic (*Gootland*) in Western Europe to the Gobi (*Drye See*) in Outer Mongolia. A majority, mostly appearing in the setting of various of the *Canterbury Tales*, are in France and West Flanders, Italy, and Spain. The thumbnail sketch of the Knight in the General Prologue with a number of names concentrated in southern Spain, north-west Africa, and what later came to be called the Levant, partakes of the nature of a patter song, as does the batch—a job lot indeed—in the *Book of the Duchess* ll. 1024-29. Of the others one can only say that they are pretty miscellaneous and occur scattered all over the place in Chaucer's poems. In the past editors have defined as an unidentified region or place in Italy what is actually the family name or designation *Panyk*; since readers will consequently expect to find it here, I have included it though it properly belongs in a dictionary of personal names. In "Chaucer's Great Britain" I gave wherever possible specific references to the Muirhead guides to London and to England and in some earlier geographical papers, organized more or less along the present lines and dealing with Continental names (e.g., "The Pilgrim Diary of Nikulás of Munkaþverá," *Mediaveal Studies*, VI [1944], 314-54), I systematically gave references to the latest available German edition of various Baedeker guides. This procedure I have discontinued here, not to save myself some small labor but because such specific references assume not altogether realistically that the reader will have access to the very edition (with appropriate page-number) cited. Hence I will here merely remind the reader that he is likely to find much interesting historical information in compendious form about most of the places here discussed in almost *any* edition of the guidebooks of Baedeker and Muirhead. For the modern rendering of the names I have generally followed the excellent and comprehensive Merriam-Webster *Webster's Geographical Dictionary* (Springfield, Mass., 1949).

As in "Chaucer's Great Britain" I give where possible a brief etymology of the names dealt with; many of these are clearly understood and are meaningful to western scholars—unlike the etymologies of the ancient and Biblical names which so often are shrouded in antiquity and of disputed origin. For all sorts of helpful information about, and leads on, names with a Tatar-Mongol background I am particularly grateful to Professor Francis W. Cleaves of Harvard University, as I am to Professor Richard N. Frye for a systematic transliteration of the Arabic forms of certain Spanish and North African names.

Only exceptionally are the variants of the geographical and ethnic names in Chaucer manuscripts either interesting or useful from a geographical point of view; for they are by and large either merely obvious spelling variants such as *i* for *y*, *ei* for *ay*, and the like, or else they are egregious scribal blunders arising from ignorance of the names in question. For Chaucer's works as a whole the variants are adequately, representatively, and conveniently given by Skeat and Robinson, but in the case of the voluminous and complete variants furnished by Manly and Rickert for the *Canterbury Tales* and distributed in a strange order of tales through three volumes (V-VII) of their Chicago edition, it has seemed worthwhile to include precise references to their apparatus.

The abbreviated titles of Chaucer's own writings are those of John Strong Perry Tatlock and Arthur G. Kennedy, *A Concordance to the Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (based on the Globe edition), Washington, D.C., 1927. A coded list of titles used here more than once follows:

List of Coded Titles

B & D William Frank Bryan and Germaine Dempster *et al.*, edd., *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, Chicago University Press, 1941.

Cook Albert Stanborough Cook, "The Historical Background of Chaucer's Knight," *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, XX (1916), 161-240.

C & S-W Samuel Hazzard Cross and Olgerd P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor, transl., *The Russian Primary Chronicle*: *Laurentian Text*, Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1953.

Du Cange Sieur (Dominus) Du Cange (né Charles Du Fresne), *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*, etc., 7 vols, Paris, 1840-50.

EB *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th edition, London-New York, 1929.

EI *Enciclopedia Italiana di scienze, lettere ed arte*, Rome, 1929-37.

E Isl *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Leyden, 1913-38.

EUI *Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada*, Barcelona, 1912-33, with continuing supplements.

Förster *Themse* Max Förster, "Der Flussname Themse und seine Sippe," *Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-histor. Abteilung, 1941, Vol. 1.

G & I Boris D. Grekov and A. Iakoubovski, François Thuret transl., *La Horde d'or: la domination tatare au XIII^e^ et au XIV^e^ siècle de la Mer Jaune à la Mer Noire*, Paris: Payot, 1939; there is a later edition of the Russian original.

Gröhler Hermann Gröhler, *Ueber Ursprung und Bedeutung der französischen Ortsnamen*, 2 vols, Heidelberg, 1913, 1933.

Holder Alfred Holder, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz*, 3 vols. including addenda to Vol. I, Leipzig, 1896-1913.

Longnon Auguste Longnon, *Les Noms de lieu de la France*, etc., Paris 1920.

Lowes John Livingston Lowes, "The Dry Sea and the Carrenare," *Modern Philology*, III (1905-06), 1-46.

Manly John Matthews Manly, *Canterbury Tales by Geoffrey Chaucer*, corrected printing, New York, 1928.

Matthias Walther Matthias, *Die geographische Nomenclatur Italiens im altdeutschen Schrifttum*, Leipzig, 1912.

MED *Middle English Dictionary*, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1952 ff.

M-L Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch,* 3d edition, Heidelberg, 1935.

M & R John Matthews Manly and Edith Rickert, *The Text of the Canterbury Tales studied on the Basis of All Known Manuscripts,* 8 vols., Chicago University Press, 1940.

MS *Mediaeval Studies,* Toronto, Ontario: The Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1938 ff.

NED *A New* (alias *Oxford*) *English Dictionary,* etc., Oxford, 1888-1928.

NGF Joseph Mansion, "De voornaamste Bestanddeelen der vlaamsche Plaatsnaamen," *Nomina geographica Flandrica, Studiën,* Vol. III, Brussels, 1935.

Nissen Heinrich Nissen, *Italische Landeskunde,* 2 vols in 3 pts, Berlin, 1883-1909.

OGN Joseph Mansion, *Oud-Gentsche Naamkunde,* 's-Gravenhagen, 1924.

Olivieri Dante Olivieri, *Dizionario di Toponomastica Lombarda,* Milan, 1931.

Reallexikon Johannes Hoops *et al.,* edd., *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde,* 4 vols, Strassburg-im-Elsass, 1911-18.

Repetti Emanuele Repetti, *Dizionario geographico-fisico-storico della Toscana,* 6 vols, Florence, 1833-46.

Robinson Fred Norris Robinson, ed., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (in later printings but without change in contents titled *The Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*), 1st ed., Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin, 1933; 2d revised edition in press.

Skeat Walter William Skeat, ed., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer,* 7 vols., Oxford, 1894-97.

Tatlock John Strong Perry Tatlock, *The Scene of the Franklin's Tale Visited,* London: Chaucer Society, 2d Series, No. 51, 1914.

W & P Alois Walde and Josef Pokorny, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen,* 3 vols., Berlin, 1930-32.

A

AFRIKE, see *MS* XV, 108.

ALEXANDRYN, see *MS* XVI, 152.

ALGEZIR (var. M & R V, 6), Algeciras (prov. Cadiz), Spain, seaport 6 m. W of *Jubaltare,* is mentioned in *CT* A 57 as a place at the siege of which (1344? 1369?) the Knight had been; see Cook 217-28, Robinson 753, col. 1-2.

In antiquity *Portus Albus,* also *Julia Joza, Julia Transducta,* the present name is adapted from Arab. *al-Djazira* (*al-Qadra*) "(Green) Island," apparently from the verdure of the region, reflected still in *Isla Verde* just offshore (*E Isl* I, 277). For various rather distorted OFr. forms see Cook 217; Chaucer's form is a shortening of the Spanish name, presumably by way of French.

ALYSAUNDRE, see *MS* XVI, 152; Chaucer's *au* shows a normannization of OFr *Alisandre.*

APENNYN (var. M & R VI, 247), the Apennine range or the Apennines, central mountain system of Italy, is described in *CT* E 45 as *hilles hye,* in E 46 said to form the western boundary of *Lumbardye.*

The name in this form (singular) looks back to Roman (Ligurian?) *Apenninus* (*Mons*), used by Petrarch and modernized by Chaucer; the modern forms are usually plural: Ital. *Appennini* (but *Appennino* sg. for the range as a whole), Fr. *Apennins,* English *Apennines.*

ARAB(Y)E, ARABYEN "B," see *MS* XV, 109.

ARABIK, see *MS* XVI, 152.

ARAGON, Aragon (Span. Aragón), region and ancient kingdom comprising the present-day Spanish provinces of Huesca, Zaragoza, Teruel, lies just W of *Cataloigne* with which it formed in Chaucer's day a joint kingdom. Along with *Cataloigne* it is mentioned in *HF* 1248 (3, 158) (:*clarion*) as a land notable for its clarion- or trumpet-players. On the festive and ceremonial role of the trumpet in this region in the thirteenth, hence presumably in Chaucer's fourteenth century, see Higini Anglès, *La Musica a Catalunya fino al segle XIII* (Barcelona, 1953), a reference for which I am most grateful to Dr. Walter Muir Whitehill. Chaucer could have learned of the practice of this art in Catalonia and Aragon through many channels.

The regional name is based on the river-name Aragón; Chaucer's form shows the Spanish stress on the ultima.

ARMORIK(E) (var. M & R VI, 577, 612; VII, 510), Armorica (Old Breton *Armorik*, later Breton *Arvorek, -ik*), formally answers to Gallo-Lat. *Aremoricae*, referring to some of the costal region of later-day Brittany and Normandy; in *CT* F 729 it is equated with *Britaigne* II (*MS* XVI, 136) as the scene of the main part of the Franklin's Tale. In *CT* B^2 *3578 (2388) it is the homeland of Genylon-Oliver, i.e., a Ganelon type Oliver or completely disloyal friend; see Robinson 855, col. 2, *ad fin.*

The name is based on Gaulish *ar-* "on, upon" and *mor-* "sea" with reference to the lay of the land; on this name see further Holder I, 202-03; Max Förster, Herrig's *Archiv*, CXLVI (1923), 134. With similar implications are Irish *Letha* and Welsh *Llydaw*, based on the stem *līt-* in Lat. *lītus* "shore", both being names for Britanny and with similar implications; cp. *Lettow*. Chaucer's form is adapted from Fr· *Armorique* in turn looking back to Med. Lat. *Armorica* (sing.).

ARRAS, Arras on the Scarpe (dép. Pas-de-Calais) in northern France and chief city of the county of *Artoys*, is referred to in *RR* 1234 (*Roman de la Rose* 1212) in praising a suckeny or smock worn by Franchise, said to be the fairest *in all Arras*; in the French text the *sorquenie* "suckeny" is said to be the richest from anywhere to Arras (*n'ot si riche jusqu'a Arraz*). Arras was early known for its woollen manufacture and production of tapestries (see *NED s.v.* "arras"). The original name of the place was *Nemetocen(n)a*; Holder II, 711.

The name looks back to the Gallo-Lat. tribal name *Atrebates* "possessors, residents" (Holder I, 267-71), later contracted to *Atradis, Atrasi*(*civitas*), OE *Aðerats* (*MS* II, 248), whence the modern form; see further Gröhler I, 89, Longnon No. 413.

ARTOYS, Artois, ancient countship of *Fraunce*, bounded on the N by *Flaundres*, on the S by *Pycardie*, and corresponding in the main to the modern department of Pas-de-Calais, is mentioned in *CT* A 86 along with *Flaundres* and *Pycardie* as the scene of the Squire's military activities. His *chyvachie* (A 85) is possibly with reference to the 1369 campaign of Edward III or to the so-called crusade (1383) of Henry le Despenser, bishop of Norwich; see Robinson 754, Squire, headnote.

Like *Arras*, this regional name looks back to the tribal name *Atrebates*, specifically (*pagus*) *Atrebatensis*; Gröhler I, 89; Longnon No. 413.

ASYE, see *MS* XV, 110.

B

BEL-MARYE (var. M & R V, 256) in effect corresponds to the present-day region of Morocco (*Marrok*) or *Al-Maghrib al-Aqsa* ("The Far West") of Arab geography and was in Chaucer's day the territory ruled by the Berber dynasty of the *Banu Marin* or Marinides "sons of Marin" (*E Isl* I, 464-66); the dynastic name is here extended to the territory, of which the chief town was Tlemcen (*Tramissene*). *Bel-Marye* is mentioned in *CT* A 57 as a region where the Knight had fought (see also *Algezir* and Cook 228-29); in A 2630 it is a region abounding in fierce lions; for other North African lions see *Libie* (MS XV, 123).

The dynastic name *Banu* or *Beni Marin* became distorted in OFr, perhaps by popular etymology, to *Belle-Marine, Bel-Marin, Belle-Mari* (see Cook 228, Manly 499 near end), whence into Middle English as in Chaucer, as *Bal-Meryne* in John Barbour's *Bruce* XX, 393, and as *Bel-More* in the *Sowdone of Babylone* 3122.

BOLOIGNE:

I. (var. M & R V, 42) in *CT* A 465 refers to Boulogne-sur-Mer (dép. Pas-de-Calais), France, one of the goals of the Wife's many pilgrimages; in this instance the specific reference would be to the cathedral church of Notre Dame in the so-called "Haute Ville," destroyed in the French Revolution and replaced by a modern structure. The harbor of Boulogne is the Roman *Gaesoriacus* (Holder I, 1512-13), later *Boninia* (*Bunne* of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*). It may be noted that Boulogne-sur-Gesse (Haute-Garonne) was named after *Boloigne* II; see Longnon No. 2459. Boulogne is still a middle-class English week-end tourist attraction.

II. (var. M & R VI, 353, 369) Bologna, Italy, on the edge of the Emilian plain (see *Emele*) some 50 m. N of Florence, is mentioned in *CT* E 686, 763, 939, 1069, as the home of the Count of Panico (*Erl of Panyk*), brother-in-law of Marquis Walter of *Saluces* and the town where for years Walter kept his and Griselde's daughter and son (*EI* VII, 329-31, and see also *Panyk*).

The name of both the French and Italian town looks back to Celto-Lat. *Bononia* (Holder I, 482-87), both later yielding by dissimilation *Bolonia,* whence respectively Fr. *Boulogne* and Ital. *Bologna.* See Matthias 66-68 for late survivals in German of the type *Bononie* vs. *Bolonie.*

BRASILE, brazil, more commonly brazil wood, was the name first applied in western Europe in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries (Caetano da Silva, *cit. infra*, pp. 6, 9, 11, 12) to a small thorny tree or shrub with yellow blossoms native to Malaya, the *Caesalpinia sappan,* Malay *sapang,* English *sapan* or *sapan* wood (*NED s.v.*), whose wood properly treated yields a brilliant red dye; in time the word came to be used for the dye itself with the essential element brazilin. See Daniel V. Thompson, *The Materials of Mediaeval Painting* (London, 1936), pp. 116-21, also Thompson and George H. Hamilton, *An Anonymous Fourteenth-Century Treatise "De Arte Illuminandi"* etc. (New Haven, Conn., 1933), pp. 8-9, 44-45, nn. 77-79. Later the name was transferred to a related dyewood tree of the same family, the *Caesalpinia echinata,* discovered in South America by the Portuguese who were already familiar with the East Indian plant in which they had long traded. The land in the New World where it was discovered was first known as Terra de Santa Cruz but early referred to familiarly as Terra do Brazil; see F. Assis Cintra, *O Nome "Brasil" (com S ou com Z)* (São Paulo, Brazil, 1921), *passim*, also John B. Stetson, Jr., transl., *The Histories of Brazil by Pero de Magalhães* (New York: Cortes Society, 1922), II, 194-95, n. 14; there is a generous listing of early documents with various forms of the name of the dyewood in Joaquim Caetano da Silva, 'Questões Americanas . . . Brazil,' *Revista Trimensal do Instituto Historico, Geographico e Ethno-*

graphico do Brazil, XXIX (Rio de Janeiro, 1866), pt ii, pp. 5-35 (wrongly cited by Stetson). The principal source of commercial brazil wood used today in the United States is, however, the Central American tree *Haematoxylon brasiletto*, whose dye is used to a very limited extent in wool and calico printing and formerly in the manufacture of red ink. On all this see Isaac H. Burkill, *A Dictionary of the Economic Products of the Malay Peninsula* I (London, 1935), 390-91; Samuel J. Record and Robert W. Hess, *Timbers of the New World* (New Haven, Conn., 1943), p. 239; John Hutchinson and Ronald Melville, *The Story of Plants and their Uses to Man* (London: Gawthorn, 1948), pp. 241-42, 244 (colored plate). For these and other botanical references I am most grateful to Dr. Richard E. Schultes of Harvard University.

Brasile is mentioned in *CT* B^2 *4649 (3459) in the verse: *With brasile and with greyn of Portyngale* (without the editors' comma after *brasile*) (a passage cited in Portuguese translation in Caetano da Silva, p. 7; in English by Cintra, p. 31), where along with *greyn* (see *Portyngale*) its brilliant red is mentioned to imply the complexion of the Nun's Priest. There is every reason here to think of Portugal as the exporting country of the brazil wood as well as of the kermes or "grain," especially since the Portuguese are known to have traded in this dyewood (Hutchinson and Melville, p. 242).

For the etymology of *brasile* and, consequently, of the name of the South American country many suggestions have been put forward, often insubstantial; see "Analyse e Critica das Diversas Hypotheses" in Cintra, pp. 103-87, summarized pp. 8-9, to which add an elaborate and unconvincing suggestion by Leo Wiener in Stetson II, 195-203. The East Indian (Malay) name, as noted above, is *sapang* and the like, the Arabic name is *baqqam* of unknown origin (not *braza* as Hutchinson and Melville, p. 242); thus the Orient does not seem to be the promising source of the name as suggested by *NED s.v.* "brasil," headnote, and M-L 1st ed., 1911, No. 1277 "*brasile," an entry cancelled in the 3d ed. The currently accepted, though to me semantically somewhat dubious etymology bases the word on a Romanic **brasa* "live, red-hot coal," yielding north Ital. *braza*, whence Span. *brasa*, Port. *braza*, OFr *breze*, Fr. *braise*, etc. (M-L No. 1276 "brasa") plus the Latin suffix *-ilis* "having the quality of ". This Romanic **brasa* is in turn presumed to look back to a Germanic **brasa* of similar meaning, represented in Swed. *brasa* "fire, blaze," Norw. *brase* "to burn." The first to propose an etymology for *brazil wood/Brazil* based on the Port. common noun *braza* appears to have been Pedro (Pero) de Magalhaes de Gandavo, *Historia de Provincia de Santa Cruz a que vulgarmente chamamos Brasil*, etc. (Lisbon, 1576), chap. 1 *ad fin.*, fol. 7^v (see Stetson, *op. cit.*, I [facsimile], fol. 7^v; II, 23 [translation]). A similar etymology is given by Du Cange *s.v.* "brasile,' and others, including perhaps most recently Oscar Bloch and Walther von Wartburg, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue française* (Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1950), *s.v.* "braise." Elof Hellquist, *Svensk etymologisk Ordbok* (2d. ed., Lund, 1939), *s.v.* "bresilje," mentions this etymology only as a possibility and I consider his caution justified.

BRITAI(G)NE II "Brittany," see *MS* XVI, 136, with added references to Gröhler II, 9; Holder I, 603, 604-09.

BRUGGES (var. often *Brigges*, M & R VII, 115, 116, 133, 138, 185), Du. Brugge or Fr. Bruges, West Flanders, Belgium, about 6 m. from the coast, was accessible from the North Sea until the final silting up of the Zwijn in 1490. *Brugges* did much wool-trading with England and in banking was the northern counterpart of Venice in the south. In *CT* B^2 *1245 (55) where it is a *toun*, *1251 (61), *1448 (258), *1491 (301) it is the goal of a summer business trip by a French banker of *Seint-Denys*, where he appears to attend strictly to business and no nonsense.

(B^2 *1492-96 [302-06]). In B^2 *1923 (733) *Brugges* defines Sir Thopas' brown hose. See also *Flaundryssh.*

The name, of uncertain origin and meaning, was early associated with Du. *brug* "bridge" (cp. OE *Brycg* in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*) and was evidently so understood; see *NGF* III, 28, and cp. Gröhler II, 187.

BURDEUX (var. M & R VII, 67), Bordeaux on the Garonne (dép. Gironde [*Gerounde*]) in Chaucer's day belonged, if somewhat tenuously, to England along with Aquitaine. Commerce between Bordeaux and England was exceedingly active, not least that dealing with fine wines of the region. It is mentioned as a source of wine in *CT* A 397, C 571 (where it is a *toun*), in the latter instance with the strong suggestion that the wines of Bordeaux and La Rochelle (*The Rochele*) were being challenged in popularity with the stronger Spanish wines of *Lepe.*

The name looks back to Rom. (Iberian?) *Burdigala* (Holder I, 633-37), later *Burdegala*, OFr *Bordele*, later *Bordeux*; see Gröhler I, 64-65. For *Bordeuz*, even *Burdegale*, of very different origin see Gröhler II, 260; Longnon No. 2708.

BURGOYNE, the old French duchy of Lower Burgundy (Fr. *Bourgogne*) with Dijon as its capital, is mentioned in *RR* 554 (not in *Roman de la Rose* 542), where "*Fro Jerusalem into Burgoyne*" expresses a great distance within which no girl had a neck fairer than Ydelnesse (*RR* 593).

Like *Fraunce* itself the name is Germanic, Med. Lat. *Burgundia*, whence the French and Chaucer's form (Gröhler II, 4-5); the ethnic name *Burgundiones* survives in the Fr. adj. *bourguignon* "Burgundian" (Longnon No. 535). The original home of the Burgundians seems to have been on the Danish island of Bornholm in the Baltic, ON *Burgundarholmr* "island of the Burgundians" and OE *Burgenda land* of similar meaning; see further *Reallexikon* I, 357-58.

CARRE NAR, Qara Na'ur or Nur "Black Lake," on the eastern side of the Gobi (*Drye See*), Outer Mongolia, is mentioned in *BD* 1029 as a point on the route across the *Drye See* to which the Duchess of Lancaster would not have sent an admirer on an irksome or futile mission (so *Alysaundre, Drye See, Pruyce, Tartarye* I, *Turkye, Walakye*). See Lowes *passim.*

The name is Mongolian, looking back to *Naghur* > *Na'ur* > *Nūr*, the latter often approximating *Nōr* in pronunciation. Chaucer's form *Nar* seems to be more closely related to the type *Na'ur*, the *Nōr's* (cited and discussed by Lowes, esp. 19-21) to *Nūr*, though there is no particular reason to view Chaucer's form as suspect or in need of extensive explanation.

CARTAGE II, Cartagena (prov. Murcia), Spain, Mediterranean seaport, is mentioned in *CT* A 404 as the southern limit of a stretch of water and coastline, of which *Hulle* (*MS* XVI, 142) is the southern, with which the Shipman is intimately familiar.

The name looks back to its Roman name *Carthago* (*Nova*) (see *Cartage, MS* XV, 113-14, for the ancient African city). Chaucer's form, based on the nominative case, is a common OFr form of what is modern Fr. Carthagène and is thus homonymous with his name of the ancient city. The Spanish form in *-ena* presumably reflects the Lat. oblique cases *Carthagīn-* with long, accented *i.*

CATALOIGNE, Catalonia (Catal. *Catalunya*, Span. *Cataluña*, Fr. *Catalogne*), S of the Pyrenees and just E of *Aragón* with which it formed in Chaucer's day a joint kingdom, is mentioned along with *Agagón* in *HF* 1248 (3, 158) as a land notable for its trumpet- and clarion-players, on which see under *Aragón.*

The name, appearing in Med. Lat. as *Catalonia*, is of much discussed etymology with often fanciful proposals. It may well look back to Lat. *castellanus* "guardian of lands or castles," yielding Catal. *ca(s)tlán* > *catalán* > with the suffix *-ia* yielding *Catalunya* "land of guardians of castles;" cp. OFr *chastelain*, Fr. *châtelain*, and see *EUI* XII, 464-65. Chaucer's form is from OFr *Cateloi(g)ne*.

CHALON (var. *clothes*, MR V, 410), a sort of fabric, is here probably a blanket manufactured, or of the type manufactured, in Châlons-sur-Marne (dép. Marne), France, which along with *sheetes* is mentioned in the plural in *CT* A 4140 as part of the covering of a bed made up by the miller Symond for the Cambridge students Alain and John.

See Jean Bonnard and Amédée Salmon, edd., Frédéric Godefroy, *Lexique de l'ancien français* (Paris-Leipzig, 1901), *s.v.* "chalun", DuCange II, 303, col. 1, *s.v*· "chaluns, and p. 302, col. 2, *s.vv.* "chalo", "chalonus"; *NED s.v.* "chalon" and *s.v.* "shalloon" for a later borrowing of the same word. From OFr the word also passed into MHG as *schalûne*.

The place-name *Châlons*, whence the common noun, looks back to the Gaulish tribal name *Catu-vellauni* "good, competent warriors" or the like; Merovingian *Catalaunis* yielded successively **Chaðelons*, **Chaelons*, modern *Châlons*; see Holder I, 863-65; Gröhler I, 88; Longnon No. 411.

CIPRE, CIPRUS, the island of Cyprus (Lat. *Cyprus*), now a British Crown Colony in the eastern Mediterranean, off the Gulf of Iskanderun, formerly Alexandretta, in Asia Minor, was famed in antiquity for its copper mines and the cult of Venus; it is mentioned in *CT* B^2 *3581 (2391)—and in Lat. *de Cipro* in the preceeding heading—as the kingdom of Pierre de Lusignan (d. 1369). On other of Pierre's campaigns in which the Knight is said to have taken part see *Alysaundre*, *Lyeys*, *Satalye*.

Graeco-Lat. *Cyprus* of disputed etymology has given its name to the element copper (Lat. *Cyprium aes* "Cyprian metal," later *cyprum*); see *NED s.v.* "copper." Chaucer's *Cipre* is OFr, modern Fr. (*île de*) *Chypre*.

CIPRIS, CIPRIDE (Lat· *Cypris*, *-idis*), a Cypriote or Cypriot, earlier Cyprian. Here the Cypriote *par excellence*, Venus, is mentioned as *Cipris* in *HF* 518 (2, 10), *TC* 3, 725, as *Cipride* in *PF* 277, 652 (var. to *Cupide*), *TC* 4, 1216, 5, 208; see further *Cipre*.

The form *Cipris* is Latin, *Cipride* OFr and based on the oblique cases.

CIPRUS, see CIPRE.

COLOIGNE (var. M & R V, 42), Cologne (Germ. *Köln*, Du. *Keulen*, OE *Colon*, Fr. *Cologne*) on the Rhine, Germany, is mentioned in *CT* A 466 as a place to which the Wife had made a pilgrimage; the specific allusion would be to the reliquary of the Three Kings (Relinquienschrein der heiligen drei Könige), now part of the cathedral treasure. The cathedral was begun in 1248 and in the Wife's day, and indeed until long after, was only partly completed.

The name looks back to Roman *Colonia* (*Claudia*) *Agrippinensis* or *Colonia Agrippina*, founded 38 B·C. On Lat. *colonia* "farm settlement, development" see Gröhler II, 28-29. For ME and later forms see *NED s.v.* "Cologne"; Chaucer's form reflects the common OFr type *Co(u)loi(n)gne*, modern English Cologne is based on modern French; cp. similarly *Boloigne* I. For Fr. names based on Lat. *colonia* see Longnon No. 495 and Index.

(de) COLUMPNIS for *Columnis* (Lat. ablat. plur.) "columns," Ital. *delle Colonne*, is mentioned in *HF* 1469 (3, 379) to identify Guido, author of the *Historia Destructionis Troiae* (ed. Nathaniel E. Griffin, Cambridge, Mass.:

Mediaeval Academy of America, 1936). The name of this Sicilian writer, surely plural in form (vs. occasional *della Colonna*), refers almost certainly to his membership in the great Roman family of Colonna (Griffin, *ed. cit.*, p. xvi); *delle Colonne* or *de Columnis* thus in effect means "one of the Colonna family."

The name looks back to the title of the founder of the family, Pietro (*ca* 1100 A.D.), lord of Columna (Colonna), Palestrina, and Paliano, where Columna or Colonna refers to the town of Colonna some 15 m. SE of Rome and 4 m. NE of Frascati. The name reflects the Latin use of *columna* to define a topographical eminence (cp. *Jubaltare*, *Pileen* and *Septe*).

CORDEWANE, leather of Cordova (Span. *Cordoba*), Spain, lying SW of *Gernade*, is mentioned in *CT* B² *1922 (732) to define the leather of Sir Thopas' shoes. This Cordovan leather, in the past often called "cordwain" (*NED s.v.*), principally of tanned and dressed goat-skins, was much prized in the Middle Ages as a luxury type shoe-leather.

The name is based on Lat. (Iberian?) *Corduba* (Hispanica Baetica), birthplace of Seneca and Lucan (Holder I, 1119-24). Chaucer's and related forms look back to OFr *cordo(u)an* (OSpan. *cordovan*) with which compare the modern French name of the city, *Cordoue*; later English "cordovan" (*NED s.v.*) is a direct borrowing from Spanish.

DRYE SEE, the Gobi (Chinese *Han-hai* "dry see"), great expanse of desert country in Outer Mongolia between the Tibetan massif and the Altai Mountains, is mentioned in *BD* 1028 as a point on a route including *Carre Nar* on which the Duchess of Lancaster would not have sent an admirer on an irksome or futile mission (cp. *Alysaundre*, *Carre Nar*, *Pruyce*, *Tartarye I*, *Turkye*, *Walakye*). For the not very likely suggestion that Chaucer's "Dry Sea" might refer to one of two areas on the Arctic coast of Russia and known to Englishmen after Chaucer's time see Lowes, esp. pp. 27-29; the areas in question are or were called in Russian *sukhoe more* "dry sea" and are respectively at the mouth of the Petschora and at the east mouth of the Dviná by Archangel.

This name, reaching Chaucer through unknown channels and perhaps quite familiar to travellers of the time, is merely a translation of the Chinese *Han-hai* "dry sea," alternative designation for the Gobi, commonly called *Sha-mo* "sand desert" (see Lowes, esp. p. 17, for the term "Sandy Sea"). Also see Lowes *passim* for references to these designations in various contemporary and later writings. The modern name is Mongolian *gobi* "desert." For the practice, unusual in Chaucer, of translating foreign place-names cp. *Newe Toun*.

DUCHE, of or pertaining to Germany (High or Low), German (High or Low), is used in *HF* 1234 (3, 144) to define the language (*Duche tonge*) of pipers (MHG *pfîfers*, MLow German *pîpaere*), musicians who might play any of several wood-wind instruments and who were often able and expected to double in the strings. On the use of *Duche*, later Dutch, to embrace both High and Low German speech (High and Low Dutch of the fairly recent past) see *NED s.v.* B1 and cp. Du. *duitsch* "German" (not Dutch!), Germ. *deutsch*. Here there would be no very obvious way of knowing whether Chaucer had in mind "pipers" whose speech was Low or High German for they were ubiquitous, and it is scarcely conceivable that the matter would have been of concern to him.

Duche and its cognates look back to an Old-Germanic **þeudisk-* (cp. Lat. *Teutones*), signifying "national, popular;" see *NED s.v.* "Dutch," headnote.

E

EMELE (var. M & R VI, 248) as an infix in *To-Emele-ward*, Emilia (Lat.

Aemilia), division of N Italy lying S of the *Poo*, is mentioned in *CT* E 51 along with *Ferrare* and *Venyse* to plot the course of the river; Chaucer is here drawing directly on Petrarch (B & D 296, 8).

The name is based on that of the Rom. province named after Aemilius Lepidus, builder of the *Via Aemilia*. Chaucer's *Emele* vs. an expected *Emelye* may have been adapted arbitrarily *metri causa* or may answer to some OFr variant form; cp. his *Arabe*, alternate to *Arabye*.

F

FERRARE (var. M & R VI, 248) in Chaucer probably refers to what is now more or less the province of Ferrara rather than to the Emilian city itself which is situated not on the *Poo* proper but on the branch known as the Po di Vomano; it is mentioned in *CT* E 51 along with *Emele* and *Venyse* to plot the course of the river.

This place-name seems to be based on the stem of Ital. *ferro* "iron" *ferraria*, *ferriera* "smithy, iron-works" (Dante Olivieri, *Dizionario etimologico italiano* (Milan, 1953), *s.v.* "ferro", but the settlement itself is of uncertain, post-Roman origin and presumably mediaeval (*EI* XV, 41); it is not to be identified with any known Roman settlement such as *Forum Alieni* of Gallia Transpadana as given in some dictionaries. Chaucer has here substituted *Ferrare* for Petrarch's *Flaminia* (B & D 296, 8), the latter used by Petrarch in a learned sort of way (cp. *Venyse*) with reference to the Roman judicial district *Flaminia*, set up in the second century A.D. and corresponding to the former territory of the Senones.

FYNSTERE (CAPE OF) (var. M & R V, 6), Cape Finistere (Span. *Capo de Finisterre*), north-western headland of the region of Galicia (now prov. Coruña), Spain, is mentioned in *CT* A 408 as the southern terminus of a stretch of European coast, of which *Gootland* is the northern, very familiar to the Shipman. This headland, some 40 m. due W of *Seint-Jame*, must also have been a familiar and cheering sight to many English pilgrims of Chaucer's day who proceeded to the shrine of Santiago by sea and who were on the point of rounding the cape to enter, say, the port of Padrón. Finistère in Brittany (Gröhler II, 140), westernmost department of France with its capital Quimper, cannot be thought of here.

The name is a learned and obvious construction, based on Med. Lat. *finis terrae*, with which compare *Land's End* in Cornwall and the French department name.

FLAUNDRES, Flanders (Fr. *Flandre*, Du. *Vlaanderen*), in Chaucer's day a countship and essentially that part of present-day Belgium (West Flanders) bounded on the E by the Schelde and including the towns of *Brugges*, *Gaunt*, *Ypres*, and *Popering*; it was bounded on the S by the county of *Artoys*. In *CT* A 86 it is one of the areas along with *Artoys* and *Pycardie* where the Squire had fought. In B² *1908-09 it is the homeland of Sir Thopas, a *fer contree* and *al biyonde the See* (i.e., North Sea), in *1912 it is the *contree* of which Sir Thopas' father is *lord*, as if doubling for Louis II de Mâle, Count of Flanders, 1346-1382! In C 463 it is the homeland of the three dissolute criminals of the Pardoner's Tale, and in B² *1389 (199), *1429 (239), *1490 (300) it is the goal, specifically *Brugges*, of a business-trip made by a French banker from *Seint-Denys*.

The name is of uncertain origin; for speculations see *NGT* III, 164-65 and *OGN* 85-86. Chaucer's form with *au* (so in *Alysaundre*, *Fraunce*, *Gaunt*) reflects a normannization of OFr plur. *Les Flandres*.

FLAUNDRYSSH (var. M & R V, 23), adj. rare and obs. (*NED* and *MED s.v.* "Flandrish"), of or pertaining to Flanders, Flemish, made in Flanders or in the

Flemish style, is used in *CT* A 272 to define the Merchant's beaver (*NED s.v.* 2b, 3) or hat made of beaver's fur (*bever-hat*, Du. *beverin hoed*, Fr. *chapeau de castor*), later often called a "caster" or "castor" (*NED s.v.*, sb.,[1] 3). It would seem that there are very few documents on the Flemish hatters' trade since that played no great part (vs. the textile industry) in the economy of the cities of mediaeval Flanders. There is some brief discussion of the hatters' guild in Bruges in Jean Gailliard, *De Ambachten en Neringen van Brugge*, etc. (Bruges, 1851), Pt. ii, pp. 183-84, also in Victor Gaillard, 'Etudes sur le commerce de la Flandre au Moyen Age', *Annales de la Société d'Emulation pour l'Etude de l'Histoire et des Antiquités de la Flandre*, XII (2d sér., VIII) (Bruges, 1850), 118(c), where reference is to Lappenberg's *Urkundliche Geschichte der deutschen Hanse*, also p. 126 under "Castor (peaux de)". For the general tenor of the above statement and the two references given I am grateful to Dr. René Derolez of the University of Ghent. On the sale of this fashionable headgear in Chaucer's London see Manly 514, n. 270 ff.

The adj. *Flaundryssh* is based on *Flaundres* plus the English suffix *-ish*. If the samples in the *NED* and *MED* are statistically valid, this was in Chaucer's day, as later, a relatively rare or unusual alternate to the adj. "Flemish" of identical meaning.

FRA(U)NCE, in Chaucer's day a general term for most of the area now identified with France, is mentioned in various connections. As a whole it is referred to in *RR* 495 (*Roman de la Rose* 483: *tot le reiaume de France*) as *all the rewme of France* and in the same words in *CT* B^2 *1306 (116); the melody of the roundel at the end of *PF* is said to have been *imaked . . . in Fraunce* (*PF* 677); in *Ven* 82 Otes or Oton de Granson is said to be the flower of the poets of France. In *CT* F 1118 *Orliens* is said to be in France. Finally, in *CT* B^2 *1341 (151) *Fraunce* identifies St Denis, patron saint of the country, and in B^2 *1384 (194) the traitor Ganelon of the *Chanson de Roland.*

For special parts of France see *Artoys*, *Britai(g)ne* II, *Burgoyne*, *Loreyne*, *Pycardie*, also the cities of *Arras*, *Boloigne* I, *Burdeux*, *Kayrrud*, *Orliens*, *Parys*, *Pedmark*, *Reynes*, (*The*) *Rochele*, *Seint-Denys*, and *Valence*, the rivers *Oyse* and *Sayne*, and the arm of the sea *Geroude.*

The name *Fraunce* (Med. Lat. *Francia*), like *Burgoyne* and *Loreyne*, is Germanic and is based on the tribal name of the Rhineland Franks, first applied to an area extending from about Soissons (dép. Aisne) to the Loire; see Gröhler II, 6; *Reallexikon* II, 83, col. 1, §6. Chaucer's *au* (so in *Alysaundre*, *Flaundres*, *Gaunt*) reflects a normannization of OFr *France.*

FRENSSH:

I. adj. of or pertaining to France, French, is used in *CT* I 248 to indicate the national origin of a contemporary song "*J'ay tout perdu mon temps et mon labour;*" see Robinson 875, n. 248.

II. adj., sb., French, the French language, is referred to in *CT* A 124 for whatever sort of French the Prioress spoke as contrasted to the Parisian French of A 126; cp. *MS* XVI, 149, under "Stratford-atte-Bowe."

Frenssh looks back to OE *Frenċisc*, based with *i*-mutation on the element *Franc-* in OE *Francland*, Lat. *Francia*, or the like.

FRISE, Friesland, also Frisia (Du. *Vriesland*, Fris. *Fryslân*, Fr. *Frise*), coupled with *Rome*, is mentioned in *RR* 1093 (not in *Roman de la Rose* 1076) to suggest—somewhat oddly—a source of great amounts of gold more precious than the jewelled chape in a girdle worn by Richesse. Chaucer surely picked this name at random (: *noble wise*). *Frise* is mentioned in *Buk* 23 as a region unpleasant, even perilous, to be taken prisoner in, yet better perhaps than to be trapped into marriage! Chaucer may have had in mind a rather shortlived and abortive expedition by Count Albrecht of Holland, supported by French and Bavarian knights and English archers, against West Lauwers Friesland in August-September 1396; see Skeat I, 558-59, n.

Chaucer's form is French. The name is of uncertain origin but appears as *Frīsii* "Frisians" as early as Pliny and Tacitus; see *Reallexikon* II, 100-01, §7.

GALICE, Galicia, prov. Coruña, Spain, formerly an independent kingdom but in Chaucer's day a part of the kingdom of Castile, is mentioned in *CT* A 466 to locate *Seint-Jame.*

The name (Rom. *Call[a]ecia, Gallaicia*) is based on the Iberian tribal name *Call(a)eci, Gallaici* (Holder I, 701, 1638); Chaucer's form is French. (It may be noted that the Spanish name has nothing to do with Galicia, now partly in Poland, partly in the Ukraine [Russ. *Galich, Galitsiya,* Ukrain. *Halicz,* Germ. *Galizien*], mediaeval Polish principality, based on the name *Galich,* once an important town, now an insignificant village.)

GAUNT, Ghent (Du. *Gent,* Fr. *Gand*), capital of East Flanders, Belgium, at the junction of the Lys (Du. *Leie*) and the Schelde or Schelt (Fr. *Escaut*), was in Chaucer's day at the height of its prosperity and the center of a great textile industry in connection with which it is mentioned in *RR* 574 (*Roman de la Rose* 564: *Ganz*) and *CT* A 448.

The name is first recorded as Med. Lat. *Gandavum* (Holder I, 1981), apparently based on a stem *Gand-* of unknown origin and meaning; see *NGF* III, 47; *OGN* 127-28; Förster *Themse* 312-13, n. 1, 442, n. 1. Chaucer's form, still familiar in the name of the great Duke of Lancaster, John of Gaunt, reflects with its *au* (so *Alysaundre, Flaundres, Fraunce*) a normannized form of OFr *Gant* without *i*-mutation vs OE *Gend* and the modern Dutch and English forms with *i*-mutation.

GERNADE (Var. M & R V, 6), Granada on the Genil or Jenil (Romano-Iberian *Singilis,* later Arab. *Shinīl,* Holder II, 572 "Singilia"), in Chaucer's day capital of the independent Moorish kingdom of Granada, now chief town of the maritime province of Granada, S Spain, is mentioned in *CT* A 56 as a place at the siege of which the Knight had been; see Robinson 753, col. 1 "The Knight."

The origin of the name is disputed but perhaps looks back to Arab. *Qarnatta* (*al-Yahud*) "hill (of the Jews)"; more doubtful would be a derivation from the common noun *granada* "pomegranate" which appears on the city's coat of arms (but see *E Isl* II,^{1} 175-77) and may represent a popular etymology, comparable to the later identification of the Swiss capital *Bern(e)* (from Italian *Verona*) with "bear"; on this latter see *MS* VII, 91-92 "Berne".

GEROUNDE (var. M & R VI, 629) refers in *CT* F 1222 to the Gironde, estuary or arm of the sea some 45 m. long beginning at the juncture of the Garonne and the Dordogne and is said to be the southern limit, of which the *Sayne* is the northern, of a stretch of French coast from which a scholar of *Orliens* in the Franklin's Tale is to remove all rocks and reefs. Cp. *Kalevala* 40:41-60.

The name is perhaps etymologically to be associated with the brook-name Gironde (dép. Hautes-Alpes); see Holder I, 2014 "*Gerontona".

GOOTLAND (var. *Gut-, Guth-land,* M & R V, 36), most likely Gottland or Gotland (official Swed. *Gotland,* OSwed. *Gotland,* Old Gutnish *Gutaland*), island in the Baltic and a prov. of Sweden, is mentioned in *CT A* 408 as the northern terminus, of which *Fynystere* was the southern, of a stretch of European coast familiar to the Shipman. Identification of Chaucer's name with this island with its once great trading center of Visby seems very likely despite one phonetic imperfection. The weak link here is the long *o* (*oo* of most Mss.) as pointed out by Kemp Malone, "King Alfred's 'Geats'," *Modern Language Review*, XX (1925), 6, who urged identification with the Danish peninsula of Jutland (Dan. Jylland); as he in effect says, a cape-to-cape delimitation would here be very neat. But it is hard to feel very sure about the curious Alfredian *Gotland*, apparently Jutland, vs. his *Gotland* "Gotland," while the six-century time-gap between Alfred and Chaucer with no intervening support is very great.

The first element of Gotland is related by vowel gradation to the name of the Goths and to that of the early inhabitants of Swedish (Oester) götland (ON *Gautar*, OE *Géatas*). The origin of the name of the Jutes and of Jutland (ON *Jótaland*, OSwed. *Jútaland*) is obscure; *Reallexikon* II, 623, "Jüten."

I (Y)

YPRES (var. M & R V, 40), Ieper (Fr. *Ypres*) on the Ieperleet (Fr. *Yperlée*) was in the Middle Ages along with *Brugges* and *Gaunt* one of the great towns of West *Flaundres* and, like the others, owed its prosperity to its textile industry. The magnificent Cloth Hall (Les Halles) was destroyed in World War I. It is mentioned in connection with the textile industry in *CT* A 448.

OFr *Ipre(s)* is the source of Chaucer's form and that of modern English and French. During and after World War I a pronunciation [*wiperz*] came to be commonly used in substandard English and often jocosely by Standard speakers after the first of the three great battles of Ypres in October-November 1914. Despite a not uncommon semipopular notion the word "diaper" is not based on "*drap d'Ypres*;" see *NED s.v.* "diaper."

ISPANNIE, gen. sing. of Lat. *(H)ispania*, Spain, is used in the heading before *CT* B^2 *3565 (2375). On this name see under *Spaigne.*

ITALY(L)E "C," see *MS* XV, 121. The following towns and localities of mediaeval Italy are in one way or another mentioned or inferred: *Apennyn*, *Boloigne* II, *(de) Columpnis*, *Emele*, *Ferrare*, *Lynyan*, *Lumbardes. Lumbardia/-ye*, *Melan*, *Padowe*, *Pavye*, *Pemond*, *Pyze*, *Poilleys*, *Poo*, *Rome*, *Saluces*, *Venyse*, *Vesulus*. Cp. also *jane* and the estate or family name *Panyk*.

JANE (M & R VI, 360; VII, 185), a small silver coin of the great seaport town of Genoa (prov. Genova), Italy, current in England in the fourteenth century, is mentioned in *CT* B^2 *1925 (735) (*many a jane*) to describe the cost of Sir Thopas' robe of the material ciclaton; in E 999 it expresses the small worth (*deere ynogh a jane*) of the chatter of the hoi polloi.

The coin-name is based on OFr *Janne(s)* (also *Genes*, *Jeynes*), modern Fr. *Gênes*, Ital. *Genova*, looking back to the Roman name *Genua* (Holder I, 2005-07) perhaps of Ligurian origin. Cp. also ME *Janeway(s)*, *Geneway*, sb. and adj., "Geno(v)ese", native of Genoa, based on OFr *genoueis* (Engl. *Genoese*), Ital. *Genovese*. See further *NED s.v.* "jane."

JEW "C," "D," see *MS* XV, 122.

JEWERYE, see *MS* XV, 122; XVI, 155.

JUBALTARE (var. M & R V, 529), Rock of Gibraltar (Span. *peñón de Gibraltar*), well marked promontory (*Mons Calpe* of antiquity) in a British enclave in the Spanish province of Granada—since 1704 a Crown Colony—is mentioned in *CT* B 947 to define the 15 m. strait (*narwe mouth*, B 946) to which it has now given its name; Chaucer seems to have thought of it as the Strait of *Marrok.*

The African side of the strait is marked by the promontory of *Septe* (*Abyla* of antiquity) which with *Mons Calpe* made up the *Herculis Columnae* or Pillars of Hercules (see *Pileer*, *MS* XV, 127).

The name *Jubaltare* looks back to Arab. *Djabal Tarik* (*ben Zaid*) "Mountain of Tarik (son of Zaid)", first landing place of that Moorish invader in 711 A.D., on which Chaucer's form is based. The modern name Gibraltar shows an intrusive *r*(*-bra-*), paralleled in Spanish in *estrella* "star" vs. Lat. *stella*. See *E Isl* II^1, 169.

KAYRRUD (var. often *kynrede*, M & R VI, 585) is used in *CT* F 808 to indicate the home, perhaps manor, of the Breton knight Arveragus and is said (F 801) to be not far from *Pedmark*; it has defied identification.

As a name (Tatlock 13-16) it surely answers to Welsh *caer rydd* "red fort," Breton *ker ru* "red village, house," but in the Breton of Chaucer's day *caer ruz* (*z* more or less = ð); if transmitted to Chaucer through a French source one would expect here *car* (or *kar*) *ru* (*Carru*). Tatlock 15 suggests not implausibly that the form *Kayrrud* may be Chaucer's effort to render a Breton *Caerruz* as he heard it rather than ever saw it written. Except for *Kérity*, harbor of Penmarch, there are no *Car-*/*Ker-*names in the vicinity, though such names occur in Britanny by the thousand, overwhelmingly to designate a private house or property (Longnon 1304-09). Chaucer's "Red House" may be merely the name of Arveragus' manor and invented at that.

L

LEPE (prov. Huelva), Spain, small town *ca* 8 m. from Ayamonte and *ca* 3 m. in from the Atlantic coast, is mentioned in *CT* C 563 to define a white wine; in C 570, where it is a *toun*, the reference is again to the wine of the place with a strong implication that it is headier than French wines imported via *The Rochele* and *Burdeus*.

According to *EUI* XXX, 64, col. 2, the name looks back to a Roman (Iberian?) *Leptis*.

LETTOW (var. M & R V, 6), the kingdom of Lithuania (Lith. *Lëtuvà*, Finnish *Liettus*, Fr. *Lituanie*, Med. Lat. *Lit*[*h*]*uania*, whence the modern English name), in Chaucer's day embraced a large territory S of Kurland (now part of Latvia), including Volhynia and part of the Ukraine to the Black Sea; it is mentioned in *CT* A 54 as a region in which the Knight had campaigned; cp. also *Pruyce* and *Ruce*.

Lith· *Lëtuvà* is perhaps based on a stem represented in Lat. *līt-us* "shore" and hence may signify "coastal region"; so Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, fascicle 7 (Bern, 1953), pp. 664-65, under *lei-* "pour, flow." Chaucer's form seems to be close to the native name; see Skeat V, 7, nn. 53, 54 *ad fin.* for Lettow in mid-fifteenth-century English.

LYEYS (var. M & R V, 6) (Graeco-Lat. *Aegae*, Cilicia, SW Asia Minor), Ayash (vilayet of Seyhan), SW Turkey in Asia, and in Chaucer's day a seaport of consequence in the kingdom of Lesser Armenia (*Armenia Minor*), is on the coast of the Gulf of Iskenderun, formerly Alexandretta. It is mentioned in *CT* A 58 in connection with Pierre de Lusignan's 1367 campaign against it (Cook 229-30), in which the Knight is said to have participated. In Chaucer's day there was still a considerable Armenian population in the area, actually a sort of Armenian enclave.

The modern name Ayash looks back to the Graeco-Lat. acc. plur. *Aegas*. Chaucer's form is French and a variant of *Layas* (cp. also Ital. *Laiazzo*) whose initial *L-* is presumably the Romanic article. See Cook 229 for a variety of forms with and without the initial *L-*, also other variants.

LYNYAN (var. M & R VI, 246), Legnano (prov. Milano) on the Olona, Italy, 18 m. NW of *Melan*, is cited in *CT* E 34 to identify Giovanni da Legnano; see Robinson 813, col. 2, n. 34.

The name may look back to an older **Ledegnanum*, probably Latin **Letianum* from a name **Letinus* (*Olivieri* 305), or Lat. *Leunianum* (*EI XX*, 779).

LOREYN(E), Lorraine (Med. Lat. *Lotharingia*, Germ. *Lothringen*, OFr *Loherrei[g]ne*) in Chaucer's day referred to the Duchy of Upper Lorraine and is mentioned in *RR* 766, 767 (*Roman de la Rose* 750-51) to define certain songs sung at a festive party in the Garden of the Rose in the company of Sir Myrthe. See Ernest Langlois, *ed. cit.*, II, 302, n. 750-51, for another reference to Lotharingian songs.

The name looks back to the Germanic (Frankish) personal name *Chlodacharius*, later appearing as *Lothari regnum*, in turn yielding OFr *Loherreigne* and later forms; see Gröhler II, 326 *s.v.* "*Chlodachar*".

LUMBARDES, Lombards, natives of *Lumbardia*, *Lumbardye*, are mentioned in *CT* B^2 *1557 (367) as bankers living in *Parys*.

The ethnic name is based on the regional name *Lumbardye.*

LUMBARDIA, Lombardy (Ital. *Lombardia*) in the Latin heading before *CT* B^2 *3589 (2399) is used to define (Lat.) Barnabus (i.e., Bernabò Visconti). On this name see *Lumbardye.*

LUMBARDYE (var. M & R VI, 250-51), Lombardy (Ital. *Lombardia*), territorial division of Italy including an area extending N to the Alps, S from the Ligurian Apennines, and bounded on the S by *Emele*, and on the W by *Pemond*, including the cities of *Melan*, *Pavie*, and *Saluces*. In *CT* E 46 western *Lumbardye* is said to be bounded by the *Apennyn* and is also referred to in E 945; the region in general is mentioned in E 72, 1245. In *CT* B^2 *3590 (2400) it is used to define Bernabò Visconti of *Melan* as the scourge of the region; the same note is struck in *LGW* F 374 (G 354), where Alcestis urges the god of love not to be like *tirauntz of Lumbardye.*

Lumbardia, *Lumbardye*, "the land of the Langobards, Lombards," is a regional name in *-ia*, based on the Germanic tribal name (Lat.) *Lango-Bardi* "long beards" whose ultimate home was in the Jutland peninsula, Denmark. On this tribal name see *Reallexikon* III, 123-25; Olivieri 315-16; Matthias 124-30. Chaucer's and the modern English forms are based on French.

LUSSHEBURGHE (var. M & R VII, 470), lushburg (*NED s.v.*), a counterfeit coin imitating an English silver penny, was imported from Luxemburg in the reign of Edward III and gave rise to a word with the general sense of counterfeit money; these coins are mentioned in *CT* B^2 *3152 (1926) as the base coin with which, figuratively speaking, the clergy did not pay in connection with love-affairs (see Robinson 852, n. 1926).

The word, like the name of the place from which it is derived, is an anglicization of sorts of the Duchy, now Grand Duchy, of Luxembourg (Du., Germ. *Luxemburg*, older *Lützelburg*, Ital. *Lussemburgo*), a name based on the designation of the tenth-century ducal castle: *lucilin, -un burch* and the like (dat. sing.) "(at) the little stronghold"; cp. other German Lützelburg's.

M

MARROK (var. M & R V, 484), Morocco (Fr. *Maroc*, Span. *Marruecos*, Ital. *Marocco*, Arab. *al-Maghrib al-Aqsa*), area of NW Africa with coasts on the Mediterranean and the Atlantic, is mentioned in *CT* B 465 to define *Strayte*

(B 464), i.e., the Strait of Gibraltar (see *Jubaltare*, *Septe*), through which Custance passed on her involuntary voyage to England; see also *Pileer, MS* XV, 127. In Chaucer's day *Marrok* was virtually coextensive with *Bel-Marye*, which with Algeria constituted the Arab. *al-Djazira al-Maghrib* "The Island of the West" ("island" with reference to being bounded by the Atlantic and the Mediterranean) or now *al-Maghrib al-Aqsa* "The Far West," comprising NW Africa.

Chaucer's form is French, the off-beat first *o* of the modern English name being perhaps due to the influence of the word "Moor." The name looks back to Arab. *Marrakash*, city of W central Morroco, extended to include the whole region of which it was the ancient capital; *Marrok* and the like show western abbreviatory truncation of the final *-ash*.

MELAN (var. M & R VII, 511), Milan (Ital. *Milano*, Germ. *Mailand*) on the Olona, on the Lombard plain, Italy, is mentioned in *CT* B^2 *3489 (2399) to define Bernabò Visconti.

The name looks back to Gaulish *Mediolānum* "central point on the (Lombard) plain," with reference to Milan's geographical position, > **Meialāno* (cp. OE *Mœgelan*) > **Meilāno*, whence with reduction of the diphthong > Ital. *Milano*. See WP II, 61 near bottom; Holder II, 467-521; Matthias 132; Gröhler I, 129-30 for many examples in Gaulish territory of this wide-spread name-type. The name appears in Old Icelandic as *Mélans borg* (*MS* VI, 335). Chaucer's form reflects the common OFr type *Meland*, *Melanz* (cp. Germ. *Mailand* and Matthias 132-36) vs. modern Fr. *Milan*.

MIDDELBURGH (var. M & R V, 23), Middelburg, prov. Zeeland, near Flushing (Du. *Vlissingen*, Fr. *Flessingue*), on the island of Walcheren at the mouth of the Schelde, Holland, is mentioned in *CT* A 277 as the Continental terminus of a 125 m. stretch across the North Sea to *Orewelle* (*MS* XVI, 145-46) in Suffolk, England, which the Merchant wanted kept open for trade at all costs.

The name is of obvious derivation and means the "central stronghold or fortification," so-called because of its central position on the island of Walcheren. Chaucer's form is adapted from Dutch.

(THE) NEWE TOUN is used in *CT* G 1428 to define the alchemist Arnaldus de Villanova (1235-1312?), supposedly author of the *Rosarie* (*NED s.v.* "rosary," 1) or *Rosarium Philosophorum* of F 1429, cited by Chaucer in error for the former's *de Lapide Philosophorum* (Robinson 869, n. 1428). The name-type "new settlement" is widespread (cp. Gröhler II, 33 ff.) and Newton's, Neuburg's, Villanova's, Villanueva's, Villeneuve's (see Longnon Nos. 515-16), abound in the world. As in the case of *Drye See* Chaucer is merely translating a foreign place-name, here Lat. *Villanova*, and quite likely had no idea of, nor interest in, its identification. In actuality it is not improbably Villeneuve-Loubet, formerly Villeneuve-les-Vence in Provence (dép. Alpes-Maritimes), France; see René Verrier, *Etudes sur Arnaud de Villeneuve* (Leyden, 1947), esp. pp. 26, 42.

[NORTH SEA], see *See* under *Flaundres*, *Middelburgh*.

O

OYSE, the Oise, flowing from the Belgian frontier to join the *Sayne* at Conflans-Ste-Honorine some 40 m. below *Parys*, is mentioned in *HF* 1928 (3, 838) as one limit, of which *Rome* (*Rome* "C," *MS* XV, 128) is the other, of a great distance over which one could have heard the noise coming out of the House of Rumor (see *MS* XVI, 154, "Hous of Dedalus").

The name may look back to Gaulish *Isara* (Holder II, 72-74), yielding *Eise*, later *Oise*; see Longnon No. 700 (*Pontoise*), 729.

ORLIENS, Orléans on the Loire (dép. Loiret), France, in Chaucer's day the center of a duchy, is mentioned in *CT* F 1118 essentially as the seat of the university (Robinson 829, n. 1118) where Arveragus' anonymous brother had studied in his youth and where he had noticed a book on "natural magic" (F 1124-25) and where he hoped to track down (F 1153) some old chum.

The name looks back to the Roman gentile name *Aurelia*, whence **Aurelianum*, later *Aurelianis*; Gröhler I, 235. The coincidental relationship of the name *Aurelius/Aurelie*, Breton knight and wooer of Dorigen, to the background of the name *Orliens* would of course have been unnoticed by Chaucer.

P

PADOWE (var. M & R V, 245), Padua (Ital. *Padova*, Fr. *Padoue*) on the Bacchiglione, Italy, home of Livy and site of an old and famous university, is mentioned in *CT* E 27 as a place where Chaucer's Clerk learned his tale from Petrarch (1304-74). Much of Petrarch's later life was spent in Padua and one of his last compositions was his Latin translation of Boccaccio's tale of Griselda, probably made at Arqua (Petrarca) *ca* 15 m. SW of Padua, where he ended his life in retirement.

The name looks back to Rom. (Venetic?) *Patavium*; Chaucer's form is French, the modern English name being taken directly from Italian; see also Matthias 151-53.

PALATYE (var. M & R V, 7) (Med. Lat. *Palatia*), Balat, town and vilayet in Anatolia (Turk. *Anadolu*), Turkey in Asia, is mentioned in *CT* A 65 to define the ruler or emir (*lord*) of the Seljuk Turks with whom the Knight is said to have served.

Med. Lat. *Palatia* is apparently based on Lat. *palatium* in the extended sense of any royal residence, here perhaps signifying "region of palaces," so-called from ruins in the vicinity (Cook 235). Arabic *Balat* is a wide-spread place-name thought to represent a hybrid of Lat. *palatium* and Gr. *platea* "public square"; see *E Isl* I, 615-16. Chaucer's form is Fr.

PANYK (var. M & R VI, 313-14, 334, 353), Ital. Panico, is in *CT* E 590, 764, 939 used to define the Marquis Walter's sister and brother-in-law in whose charge Walter placed for many years his and Griselde's daughter and son. In E 589, 763, 939 it is implied that the Earl and Countess live in or near *Boloigne* II. Chaucer's *Panyk* is an obvious adaptation of Petrarch's Lat. *de Panico* (B & D 314, 47; 324, 1: *Panici comes*, matching *de Paniquo* of the French text), defining an old and once important countship (*famiglia comitale*). In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the earls or *conti di Panico* (*EI* XXVI, 195) constituted a serious threat to the expansion of the commune of Bologna (*Boloigne* II) but were finally brought to heel and obliged to live within the city.

Boccaccio gives the name in a dialectal form with *g* for *c* as *Panago*, still reflected in the little town *Borgo Panigale* some 3 m. NNW of Bologna. This family name is very likely to be identified with the grain *panico* (Lat. *panicum*) "panic-grass" (*NED s.v.*) or so-called Italian millet, perhaps once intensively grown in the area; see, for example, Holder II, 926-27, especially his final quotation from Isidore of Seville. Chaucer's form is probably an *ad hoc* anglicization either of Petrarch's *de Panico* or *de Paniquo* of the French text. In "Chaucer's 'Panik' (*Clerk's Tale*, 590)", *Modern Language Notes*, LXVII (1952), 529-31 (with many interesting references), Robert B. Pearsall is not quite right (p. 530) in describing this as "a very real place"; as is said above, it is a *fundus* or estate-name applicable to a family or to define a castle belonging to a family.

PARYS (var. M & R V, 11; VI, 70; VII, 115, 140, 144) (dép. Seine), chief city of *Fraunce*, is mentioned as a center of banking activity in *CT* B^2 *1522 (332) *1556 (366). It is the site of an abbey in B^2 *1247 (57) and B^2 *1513 (323), whose existence is implied in B^2 *1527 ff. (337 ff.) where a priest Dan John is stationed; the abbot is mentioned in B^2 *1253 (63). In B^2 *1525 (335) it is a *toun*. In *CT* D 678 it is mentioned as being near the site (until 1129 A.D.) of the nunnery of Héloise in the suburb of Argenteuil (Seine-et-Oise), 5 m. NW of Paris (*nat fer from Parys*). In *CT* A 126 it is used to describe the *Frenssh* of the city, namely "francien," the speech of the Ile de France, where this is contrasted with whatever French the Prioress may be supposed to have natively spoken (see *MS* XVI, 149, "Stratford-atte-Bowe"). In *RR* 1654 (*Roman de la Rose* 1620-21) Paris is linked with *Pavye* as a place of great attraction, though less so than the Garden of the Rose.

The name looks back to the Gaulish tribal name *Parīsii* (Holder II, 932-47), perhaps meaning "bold ones," whose chief town *Lucotetia*, also shortened to *Lutetia* (Holder II, 301-02), was rather early renamed on the basis of the tribal name (cp. *Arras*); Gröhler I, 85-86, Longnon No. 404.

PAVYE, Pavia (Rom. [Ligurian?] *Ticinum*, Holder II, 1836-40) at the juncture of the Ticino and the *Poo*, Italy, is mentioned in *RR* 1654 (*Roman de la Rose* 1620-21) along with *Parys* as a place of great attraction though less so than the Garden of Rose. In *CT* E 1246 it is the birthplace of the sixty-year-old knight of the Merchant's Tale, where the town is correctly said to be in *Lumbardye* (E 1245).

Forms *Papia*, *Papiae*, of uncertain origin, appear first in the ninth century; see Olivieri 416-17, Matthias 156-57.

PEDMARK (var. M & R VI, 584-85), very likely a distorted form of the Breton village of Penmarch (dép. Finistère) or perhaps an attempted phonetic spelling of the same, is mentioned in *CT* F 801 as being not far from the home of Arveragus, himself said to be from the uncertain *Kayrrud*; see Robinson 827, n. 801. Today a small village, Penmarch once rivalled Nantes as a seaport.

The Breton name *Penmarc'h* looks back to Breton *pen* "head" and *marc'h* "horse" and presumably referred to a rock-formation on the Pointe de Penmarch thought to resemble a "horse's head." The spelling *Ped-* vs. *Pen-* predominates in the Chaucer manuscripts and must be viewed as Chaucer's form, possibly his effort to represent a later voiceless *n*; so tentatively Tatlock 1-2, n. 2. See also Longnon No. 1345.

PEMOND (var. M & R VI, 247), Piedmont (Ital. *Piemonte*, Fr. *Piémont*), region in NW Italy crossed by the upper valley of the *Poo*, is mentioned in *CT* E 44, though wrongly, as if Petrarch had referred to it in the proem to his Latin translation of Boccaccio's tale of Griselda (B & D 296).

This regional name, not used in antiquity, first appears in the early thirteenth century and is evidently based on a pattern answering to Lat. *ad pedem Montium* "at the foot of the Mountains (i.e., the Cottian Alps)"; for forms such as *Pedemontium*, *Pedemontana regio* see Matthias 160. Chaucer's form is adapted from OFr. On the gradual growth in the extent of this region see *EI* XXVII, 185-86.

PYCARDIE, Picardy, old French province including what are now the departments of Somme, parts of Pas-de-Calais, Aisne, and Oise, is mentioned with *Artoys* and *Flaundres* in *CT* A 86 as one of the scenes of the Squire's military activity; see further under *Artoys*.

This regional name, derived from the ethnic name *Picard* "native of Picardy," does not appear until the thirteenth century and is of uncertain origin; see *NED s.v.* "picard," headnote; earlier the Picards were known as *Po(u)hiers*, surviving in the family-name *Pouyer* (Longnon No. 921).

PILEER (OF HERCULES), see *MS* XV, 127.

PYZE (var. M & R VII, 512), Pisa in the Valle del'Arno, 6 m. from the sea, is mentioned to identify Count Ugolino (*Erl Hugelyn*) in *CT* B^2 *3597 (2407), *3599 (2409), *3646 (2456), and in B^2 *3606 (2416) and in the preceeding Latin heading to identify Bishop Ruggieri (*Roger*). In B^2 3599 (2409), *3600 (2410) there is a *tour* with *dores* (B^2 *3615 [2425]), used as a prison in B^2 *3600 (2410), *3605 (2415), *3609 (2419) which is central to the story.

The name looks back to Rom. (Etruscan?) *Pisa* and *Pisae*; *EI* XXVII, 392 ff.; Repetti IV, 297 ff.; Matthias 161-62. Chaucer's form is French, the modern English Italian.

POILLEYS (var. *Poleyn[e]*, *Pule[y]n*, M & R VI, 525), adj. of or pertaining to Apulia, Apulian (Fr. *pouillois*), a region of SE Italy famed for its fine horses, is mentioned in *CT* F 195 to describe a race-horse (*courser*) comparable to one received as a gift by Cambyus Kan (not formally identifiable with Chinggis Khan); see also F 193 under *Lumbardye*. In Chaucer's day Apulia formed part of the Kingdom of Naples.

The Lat. regional name *Apulia*, in mediaeval times by aphesis often *Pulia*, looks back to the Samite tribe of the *Apuli*, early settled in that region. The mod. Fr. descendant of the aphetic *Pulia* is *Pouille*, with several OFr derivative adjectives, such as *Puillain* (*Pullan*, *Polain*), *Puilleis* (*Puilloiz*, *Pulois*), reflected in the received Chaucer form and in the variants.

POO (var. M & R VI, 248), the Po, largest river of Italy, rises (*CT* E 48) at the foot of Monviso (*Vesulus*) in the Cottian Alps on the French frontier, flows NE and then generally E, ending in a large delta which empties through several mouths into the Adriatic some 35-40 m. S. of Venice, not at or near *Venyse* as Petrarch (B & D 296, 8-10) and Chaucer may imply.

The source of the name is Romano-Celtic *Padus* (Ligurian *Bodincus*, Holder I, 457, Longnon Nos. 25, 1154) of uncertain origin; Holder II, 902-20; *EI* XXVII, 572, Nissen I, 183 ff.; Matthias 162-64.

POPERYNG, Poperinghe, *ca* 6 m. from Ypres, West Flanders, Belgium, a town prosperous in the Middle Ages through its cloth-manufacture, is mentioned in *CT* B^2 *1910 (720) as being in *Flaundres* and the birthplace of Sir Thopas.

This *ing*-name appears earliest (877, 1107 A.D.) with the habitative suffix *-hem* in *Pupringa-* (gen. plur.), *Poperinge-hem* "estate or farm of the Puprings or Poperings," the patronymic in turn based on an otherwise unidentified personal name (*OGN* 38, 39). Chaucer's and the modern name show either a loss of the terminal *-hem* or look back to a parallel uncompounded *ing*-name.

PORTYNGALE, Portugal, is mentioned in *CT* B^2 *4649 (3459) (*With brasile ne with greyn of Portyngale*, without editors' comma after *brasile*) as the exporting country of two dyestuffs, vegetable and insect respectively. For the former see under *brasile*, above. The insect dye, *greyn*, "dyers' grain" or *Grana tinctorum*, refers to kermes, oldest dyestuff on record (cp. "scarlet" in *Gen.* xxxviii, 28, 30); see further Harold N. and Alma L. Moldenke, *Plants of the Bible* (Waltham, Mass.: Chronica Botanica, 1952), Index, p. 320, col. 1, *s.v.* "Quercus coccifera," also Thompson 111-16 (see *brasile*) and Thompson and Hamilton 46-47, n. 87 (see *brasile*). This blood-red dye was obtained from the dried bodies of the parasite female scale-insect, *coccus ilicis*, after egg-laying and was ignorantly taken in Antiquity to be a seed grain which the dead bodies resemble; these "grains" have also been known as "kermes berries". The insects are found on the leaves of the bushy evergreen shrub or small tree, the *Quercus coccifera*, popularly known as the Kermes oak or Grain oak which flourishes in southern Europe, including Spain and Portugal. See *NED s.v.* "grain," sb.,[1] 10, quotation from 1617 concerning Spaniards and Portuguese as exporters of the same, also *NED s.v.* "kermes" and Du Cange *s.vv.* "graingne," "1 grana," and "2 granum." On the kermes oak in England see W. J. Bean, 'Quercus coccifera,' *The Gardener's Chronicle*, LXV (19 April 1916), 195, with photograph, also Alfred Rehder, *Manual of Cultivated Trees and Shrubs* (2d ed., New York, 1940), p. 162. Chaucer may have become familiar with the source of both brazil-wood and kermes, as well as of other commodities, through his office of Controller of Customs which he held in one way or another between 1374 and 1386. *Greyn* is used here along with *brasile* to suggest the high complexion of the Nun's Priest, as it is in *CT* B^2 *1917 (727) with reference to Sir Thopas' coloring; for a figurative use applied to *colours* in the sense of "figures of speech" see *CT* F 511.

The name (OFr *Portingale*, also *Portegale*), obsolete by-form of the name Portugal (see *NED s.v.*), looks back to Rom. *Portus Cales* (Holder I, 695, "Cales" 2), site of Oporto, today surviving in the name Vila Nova de Gaya on the left bank of the Douro (Span. Duero), Portugal.

PRU(Y)CE (var. Skeat I, 312, n. *ad loc.*; M & R V, 6):

I. sb. Prussia (Germ. *Preussen*, Fr. *Prusse*), in Chaucer's day designated essentially a part of the Baltic litoral east of Pomerania and the Vistula, more or less equivalent to later East Prussia, first with Marienburg, later Königsberg as the seat of the rule of the Teutonic Knights. In Chaucer's day the native population was to all intents and purposes Christian and largely German, and the rule of the Teutonic Knights of the Order of the Sword was beginning to weaken. *Pruyse* is mentioned in *BD* 1025 as a remote place to which the Duchess of Lancaster would not have sent an admirer on an irksome or futile mission (cp. *Alysaundre, Carre Nar, Drye See, Tartarye* I, *Turkye, Walakye*). In *CT* A 53 it is mentioned as a region where the Knight on an expedition or sojourn, presumably with the Teutonic Knights, sat at the head of the table in precedence over *alle nacions*, where "nations" refer to national groupments quite likely at the Table of Honor; see A. S. Cook, 'Beginning the Board in Prussia,' *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XIV (1915), 375-88, also Cook 209-12.

II. *Pruce* (var. M & R V, 204), adj. of or pertaining to Prussia, Prussian, is used in *CT* A 2122 to describe a type of shield carried by some of Palamon's adherents. The adjective is identical with the substantive, I, above.

The ethnic name seems first to be recorded as *Prusi* "Prussians" in the *Russian Primary Chronicle*, Foreword, §4 (C & S-W) and is the name of a Baltic tribe closely related to the Lithuanians (see *Lettow*). Early latinized *Pruzzi*, it appears as OFr *Pru(y)ce*, whence Chaucer's form; see *NED s.v.* "Prussian," B, sb. headnote. The variants *Sprus*, *Spruce*, *Sprewse*, though probably not Chaucer's, are frequent in the manuscripts and in a sense legitimate in that such forms (Med. Lat. *Sprucia*) are common in the Middle Ages and long after (*NED s.v.* "spruce") and the source of the common English tree-name.

R

REYNES, Rennes (dép. Ille-et-Vilaine) at the confluence of the Ille and the Vilaine and in ancient times known as *Condatē* "confluence" (Longnon Nos. 127-35), is used in *BD* 255 to define *cloth* with reference to a kind of fine linen or lawn made in the town; see *NED s.v.* "raines" for many references. Cp. *chalon* and *Tars* for other town-names identifying textiles.

The name, replacing older *Condatē* (Holder I, 1092-95 "Condati-" §9), looks back to the Gaulish tribal name *Rēdones*, perhaps meaning "swift ones" or "chariot using people;" see Holder II, 1102-05, Gröhler I, 80. Chaucer's *Reynes* reflects OFr *Raynes*, by-form of Rennes.

(THE) ROCHELE, La Rochelle (dép. Charente-Inférieure), France, capital of the old province of Aunis and in 1360-72 an English possession, was in the fourteenth century an almost independent commune; it is mentioned in *CT* C 571 along with *Burdeux* as an importing source of French wines.

The name is made up of **rocca* "rock" of unknown origin (Holder II, 1200; Gröhler II, 92-93; M-L No. 7357) plus the diminutive suffix *-elle* (Gröhler II, 94), the rock in question probably referring to some small stone fortification early built as a customs barrier or the like (Longnon No. 2224). In the tenth century the name appears translated as Lat. *Rupella* where Lat. *rupis* substitutes for *rocca* (Longnon 2218).

ROME "C", see *MS* XV, 128.

RUCE, RUSSYE, formally Russia, though by no means answering to the present-day Soviet Union or the former Russian Empire, is used by Chaucer in two connections. In *CT* A 54 *Ruce* is mentioned along with *Lettow* as an area where the Knight had been on military expeditions and would correspond perhaps to Russian territory eastward toward, say, Smolensk on the Dneiper, at that time near the border of the great kingdom of Lithuania (*Lettow*). In *CT* F 10 *Russeye* is a land said to have been warred upon by Cambyus Kan (not formally identifiable with Chinggis Khan), *Tartre* king of the Golden Horde with his capital then at *Sarray.*

The origin of the name, earlier *Rus*, is not altogether certain but may well look back to *Ruotsi*, Finnish name of Sweden, perhaps extended to cover Russian territory under Swedish (Varangian) control. By Chaucer's time the name had long since, however, lost any Scandinavian connotation; see further C & S-W.

Med. Lat. *Russia* (whence mod. Engl. Russia) parallels OFr *Ro(u)s(s)ie*, whence Chaucer's *Russye*; his *Ruce* seems to answer to an adjective form corresponding to Fr. *russe* and Engl. russ (cp. *NED s.v.*).

SAYNE (SEYNE) (var. *Spayne*, M & R VI, 629, and *mount* for *mouth*), great river of northern France, passes through Paris and Rouen and enters the English Channel between Honfleur and Le Hâvre (since 1516) (dép. Seine-Inférieure). The estuary (*mouth of Sayne*) is mentioned in *CT* F 1222 as the northern limit, of which the *Gerounde* is the southern, of a stretch of the French coast to be cleared of rocks and reefs dangerous to shipping. In *RR* 118 (*Roman de la Rose* 112) a stream in the Garden of the Rose is said to be somewhat smaller than the *Sayne.*

The name looks back to a Ligurian(?) *Sēquana*, whence the OFr, Chaucer's and the modern forms; adopted into OHG as *Sîgana* (with substitution of Germanic ī for Gaulish ē) it yielded *inter alia* OE *Sígen*; Holder II, 1505-10; Gröhler, I, 13-14; Förster *Themse* 582. The variant *mount of Spayne* for *mouth of Sayne* recalls *HF* 1116-17 (3, 26-27).

SALUCE(S) (var. M & R VII, 247, 249, 290, 291), Saluzzo (prov. Cuneo), region and town in *Pemond* near the *Poo* and 31 m. SSW of Turin, was before and after Chaucer's day the center of a marquisate, of which the first marquis was Bonigacio del Vaste (d. 1135); see *EI* XXX, 570-73. It is mentioned alone in *CT* E 420, 753, 775; in E 414, 1005 it is a *toun*, in E 1005 a *cité*. It is thought of as a district or *contré* in E 44, 63 (*noble*), 75, 435, 615 and in E 64 is *that lond.*

The fictional first marquis is here Walter (Gualtieri) who in E 772 is the *Markys of Saluce*, in E 64, 91, 92 and frequently *passim* simply *markys*; Griselde is the marchioness, in E 394 the *newe markysesse*, the same designation being in a sense transferred to her daughter in E 942, 1014.

In the town is the marquis' *paleys* (E 197, 262, 389, 875) or *hous* (E 478, 820, 956, 973) with a *halle* (E 263, 980, 1029, 1119), *chambre*(*s*) (E 263, 961, 980), and *houses of office* "servants' quarters and utility buildings" (*NED s.v.* "house" sb.,[1] 14; "office" sb. 9, and cp. "office-house"). Griselde's bedroom (*chambre*) is mentioned in E 515, 525, 1115, Walter's in E 870. Not far out in the country is a charming village (*throop*, E 199, 208; *village*, E 200, 272) with a village well (E 276), the home (E 277, 284; *hous*, E 332, 809, 871, 896; *place*, E 862) of Janicula/Janicle (Giannùcolo), Griselde's father; a front *dore* is mentioned in E 367, a *chambre* in E 324, 330.

The name is first recorded in the eleventh century; see *EI* XXX, 571-72 (for history), 572-73 (on the marquisate). Petrarch latinized the name of the region as *terra Saluciarum* (B & D 296, 15); Chaucer's form is French.

SARRAY, Saraï Berké or New Saraï, once great trading center and in Chaucer's day (since Uzbek Khan 1312-40) capital of the Khanate of the Golden Horde on the Akhtuba branch of the Lower Volga in the Stalingrad (formerly Tsaritsyn) Region, was predominantly Turkish with not many Mongol residents; it was destroyed in 1395 by the Berla chieftain Timūr i leng (Persian) "Timur the Lame," Turk. Tämür Läng, whence the western form Tamerlane, Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine the Great* (G & I 139-40); see *E Isl* IV,[1] 158-59; G & I 70-71, 75, 135-47. It is mentioned in *CT* F 9 as a place in the (*land of*) *Tartarye* II, and in F 46 is said to be a city of Cambyus Kan (not answering formally to Chinggis Khan), throughout which he had his birthday proclaimed and sumptuously celebrated. This New Saraï (Berké) is opposed to Saraï Batu or Old Saraï in the Volga delta (G & I 70-71, 73).

The Khan's palace (G & I 136) is mentioned in F 60, with a *halle* (F 86, 92), *halle-dore* (F 80), and *deys* (F 59). There is a keep or donjon ([*heighe*] *tour*, F 76, 340) where some of the magical birthday presents were stored for safe-keeping; the idea of the *tour* may reflect the Tower of London (see *MS* XVI, 144 "London"). There is also a *temple*, in the case of the Lower Volga Moslem Tatars a mosque (G & I 81, 137, 154), where the assembled company worships (F 296-97). Another richly tapestried room is the *chambre of parementz* (F 296) in which there is music, dancing, and feasting. Somewhere outside is a *park* (F 391) with a walk (*trench*) cut through the trees or shrubbery (F 391), the scene of the action of Part ii of the unfinished poem.

The name (and word) *Sarray*, i.e., Saraï, is Turkish, adapted from Persian *sarai* "palace;" see *NED s.v.* "serai[1]."

SATALYE, Antalya, formerly Adalia (Lat. *Attalia* in Pamphilia, Med. Lat. *Satalia*), vilayet of Konya (ancient *Iconium*), Turkey in Asia, seaport at the head of the Gulf of Antalya W of the Gulf of Iskenderun, formerly Alexandretta, was in Chaucer's day in the hands of the Seljuk Turks and their chief city (*E Isl* I, 126-27; Cook 230-31). It is mentioned in *CT* A 58 as a place in the Levant (cp. *Lyeys*, *Palatye*) where the Knight was active in some of Pierre de Lusignan's campaigns (Cook 231-32).

The name looks back to ancient *Attalia*, one of several Asia Minor cities named after Attalus II (B.C. 200-138), king of Pergamum; the town is mentioned in *Acts* xiv, 25, as the port from which SS Paul and Barnabas set sail for Antioch (v, 26). The Med. Lat. *Satalia* shows a prosthetic *S-* resulting from a false division of a preceeding Greek *eis* "to"; for this and other examples of the same phenomenon see W. B. Sedgwick, *Review of English Studies*, II (1926), 346.

SEYNE, see SAYNE

SEINT-DENYS, St.-Denis-sur-Seine (dép. Seine), France, suburb of Paris and 8 m. N of the city on route 6, is famous for its once powerful abbey, founded by Dagobert I (d. 638 A.D.) and rebuilt in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; it is mentioned in *CT* B^2 *1191 (21), *1249 (59), *1257 (67), *1498 (308), *1516 (326) as the home of a wealthy banker-merchant. The saint himself is mentioned in B^2 *1341 (151) and often elsewhere in Chaucer.

Ancient *Catulliacus* (*fundus*) was renamed for St Dionysius (Denis) (*Sancti Dionysii basilica*), legendary first bishop of Paris; of the many localities similarly named after that saint the present town is the most famous; Holder I, 849-50; Gröhler II, 402; Longnon No. 1693.

SEINT-JAME (var. M & R V, 42; cp. var. *Seint-Jakes*), Santiago (de Compostela, also de Galicia), prov. of Coruña, in the old province of *Galice* in NW Spain, is mentioned in *CT* A 466 as the scene of one of the Wife's many pilgrimages. In Chaucer's day Santiago was one of the principal pilgrim resorts of the West, still today a great tourist center, especially for Spaniards. The saint himself is often invoked and quoted elsewhere in Chaucer.

Chaucer's *Seint-Jame*, based on the name of St. James the Apostle who supposedly preached in Galicia and whose bones were reputedly discovered at Compostela, is in effect an OFr translation of Span. *Sant-iago*, where *Iago* is a dialectal (Galician?) form of *Jacobo*, *Jaime* "James." OFr *Saint-Jame* is in turn a variant of *Saint-Jacques* (cp. var. above) (see *NED s.v.* "James"). This *Iago* is presumably identical with the Iago of Shakespeare's *Othello* (both names are trisyllabic). *Compostela*, site of this great shrine, is very likely a diminutive of Span. *composta* "fortification" (*EUI* LIV, 247). Unlikely and no doubt reflecting popular etymologizing are derivations on the order of *campus stella* from a star said to have shown where the saint's remains were (*EI* XXX, 786).

SEPTE (var. M & R V, 529) is mentioned in *CT* B 947 along with *Jubaltare* to define the limits of the 15 m. strait (*narwe mouth*, B 946) known to Chaucer as the Strait of *Marrok*, today the Strait of Gibraltar (*Jubaltare*). *Septe* refers to the ridge with seven peaks in Spanish Morocco (administratively in the prov. Cadiz), called in antiquity *Septem Fratres* from their "fraternal" appearance; specifically in question is the highest (636 ft.) peak of the ridge, *Abyla* of antiquity, today Span. *Monte del Hacho* "beacon-hill mountain," Fr. *Montagne des Singes* (cp. the Gibraltar apes) and it is surely this, not the little seaport of Ceuta, that Chaucer had in mind. Together, *Abyla* and *Calpe* (Gibraltar) formed the *Herculis Columnae* or Pillars of Hercules of antiquity (see *Pileer*, *MS* XV, 127).

At the foot of the ridge was early a Carthaginian colony, probably called *Exilissa* or *Lissa civitas*, later *civitas ad Septem Fratres*, early reduced to *Septon*, later *Sebta* (whence Arab. *Sabta*), in turn with vocalization of the *b* yielding modern *Ceuta* as the name of the town, but not of the promontory. See *EUI* I, 433 "Abila"; XII, 1514 "Ceuta"; XXXII, 1264 "Marabut (al-)"; *E Isl* I, 836-38; *EB* V, 176.

SPAYNE (var. M & R VII, 66), Spain (Span. *España*, Fr. *Espagne*), is mentioned in *HF* 1117 (3, 27) with reference to a mountain peak, possibly *Jubaltare* (*MS* XVI, 154 "House of Fame"); in *CT* A 409 perhaps with reference to the entire Atlantic coast of the Iberian peninsula, including Portugal; in B^2 *3565 (2375) it defines Pedro, king of Leon and Castile (1350-69), and in C 565, 570 the heady wine of *Lepe*.

The following Spanish localities are mentioned: *Algezir*, *Aragón*, *Cataloigne*, *Fynystere, Galice, Gernade, Jubaltare, Lepe, Seint-Jame, Septe* in Africa, also indirectly Cordoba (*cordewane*) and Toledo (*Tolletanes*).

The name looks back with aphesis to Lat. *Hispania* (*Ispannie*, above). Chaucer's form is OFr *Spaigne*, var. *Espaigne*, whence Fr. *Espagne*.

(STRAIT OF GIBRALTAR), see *Strayte* under *Marrok* and *narwe mouth* under *Jubaltare* and *Septe*, also *Pileer* (*MS* XV, 127).

T

TARS (var. M & R V, 207-08) is used in *CT* A 2160 to define a textile worn in ancient Athens by King Emetreus of India and, though often used alone to refer to some kind of fine silk favored in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (*NED s.v.* "tars"), it is, like "raines" (see *Reynes*), all but certainly based on a place-name. The name in question is very likely the Cilician seaport of Tarsus, birthplace of St. Paul, on the now silted up Cydnus; in Chaucer's day it was in the kingdom of Lesser Armenia (*Armenia Minor*). Turkish since the sixteenth century it is today *Tarsus*, vilayet of Içel, S Turkey in Asia. From 550 A.D. sericulture and the silk industry flourished in the towns of Asia Minor (see *EB* XX, 664-65, *s.v.* "Silk and Sericulture") and it is apriori more likely that Tarsus should have been identified with this product than *Tartarye* I (despite the *NED s.v.* "tars"; Skeat V, 85; Manly 555).

The word, whatever its origin, appears in OFr as *tarse*, whence Chaucer's form.

TARTARYE (LAND OF) (var. M & R VI, 508), Tatary, less correctly but often Tartary (the first, false *r* apparently somehow under the influence of Classical *Tartarus*), land of the Tatars (see *Tatre*), is a loose geographical term, at one time or another including any or all areas from the Black Sea or Volga, eastward through north-central Asia, to the Manchurian coast of the Yellow Sea. Chaucer clearly uses the name with two quite distinct applications:

I. In *BD* 1025, where it is closely associated with *Carre Nar* and *Drye See*, *Tartarye* may be supposed to refer to the old Tartar homeland in Outer Mongolia (cp. G & I *passim*) and is mentioned as a region to which the Duchess of Lancaster would not have sent an admirer on an irksome or futile mission (cp. *Alysaundre*, *Carre Nar*, *Drye See*, *Pruyce*, *Turkye*, *Walakye*).

II. In *CT* F 9 the *land of Tartarye* (in F 71 *this lond*) in which *Sarray* is said to be located, refers to the steppes of southern Russia or Polovtsian steppes, an area without exact boundaries but corresponding roughly to the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, also Tatarstan; during most of Chaucer's life time it was under the weakening rule of the Western Kypchaks (G & I 21 ff.). On this western Mongol empire, the Golden Horde, founded by Batu Khan, see G & I 63 ff.

TATRE (var. M & R VI, 510, 531), (1) sb., a Tatar, inhabitant of *Tartarye* II, is used in *CT* F 28 to identify one Cambyus Kan (not answering formally to Chinggis Khan); (2) adj., in F 266 likewise identifying Cambyus Kan.

The native name *Tatar*, of unknown etymology, referred originally to a small ethnic group defeated by the Mongols (cp. G & I 43 ff.), yet whose name came to be extended by neighboring peoples to include the Mongols and hence is virtually identical with the latter.

TEWNES (var. *Twnes* for *Tunes*), Tunis, capital city of Tunisia, today a French protectorate (*Tunisie*) on the Lake of Tunis or the Bahira which communicates with the Mediterranean, replaced Carthage (*Cartage*, *MS* V, 113) in importance and in Moslem times became the chief city of the area. It is mentioned in *BD* 310 in a punning rhyme with *entunes* (var. *entewnes*) "songs" as a *toun* for which Chaucer would not exchange the pleasure of the bird-songs to which he is listening.

The name looks back to Lat. *Tūnēs, -ētis,* OFr *Tunes,* whence Chaucer's form.

TOLLETANES (var. M & R VI, 634), OFr plur. adj., of or pertaining to Toledo, Spain, Toledan, is used probably not quite accurately in *CT* F 1273 to describe a set of astronomical tables used by a scholar of *Orliens* (cp. F 1274-79). Formally Chaucer's *Tables Tolletanes* "Tables of Toledo" should refer to a set of astronomical tables first edited by Azaraquil in the eleventh century but subsequently rendered obsolete by the so-called *Alfonsine Tables,* drawn up by Jean de Linières *ca* 1320. It is unlikely that Chaucer or anyone else in his day would have any use for, or interest in, the older set; yet the old term lingered on and was, as surely here, applied wrongly to the later and more up-to-date tables. On all this see Derek J. Price, *The Equatorie of the Planetis* (Cambridge University Press, 1955), esp. pp. 79-80, with ample literature.

The French title *Tables tolletanes,* rendering Lat. *Tabulae Toletanae,* is here taken over bodily; the Lat. adj. is based on Roman (Iberian?) *Tolētum,* ancient capital of the Iberian tribe of the *Carpetāni* (Holder I, 807-08), later of the Visigoths, later still of the old kingdom of Castile.

TRAMISSENE (var. M & R V, 6), Tlemcen or Tlemsen, dép. Oran, NW Algeria (French since 1842), was in Chaucer's day a great center of trade and chief city of the Berber dynasty of the Beni or Banu Marin (*Bel-Marye*) or the Marinide dynasty in the Arab *al-Maghrib al-Aqsa* ("The Far West"), an area approximating western Algeria and Morocco (*Marrok*); see *E Isl* IV, 801-08. It is mentioned in *CT* A 62 as a place where the Knight had fought (cp. *Algezir, Bel-Marye, Gernade*).

The name looks back to Berber *tilma* "spring, well," plur. *tilimsān,* and means "(town of) springs or wells." Forms with a western substitution of *r* for *l* appear in Froissart: *Tramessemes, Tremessemes,* later *Tremesen, Tremecen* (Cook 233, and n. 7, Skeat V, 7, nn. 56-58), and on such, no doubt OFr forms Chaucer's form depends. Modern Tlemcen is adapted directly from Berber-Arabic.

TURKEYS (var. M & R V, 283), Turkish, of or pertaining to the Turks, is used in *CT* A 2895 to describe a shooting bow with a golden case (unless referring to a quiver for the arrows [*arwes in the caas*] as in *CT* A 2358) and fittings. The Turkish bow owed its excellence to its composite character (vs. bows just of yew) of horn, wood, and sinew, in that order from front to back.

Chaucer's form is OFr *turkeis,* Fr. *turquois* (fem. *turquoise* yielding the name of the gem-stone), based on *Turkye*; English "Turkish" is a late formation with the English suffix *-ish.*

TURKYE, Turkey (Fr. *Turquie,* Turk. *Türkiye*) in Chaucer's day comprised essentially the present-day Turkey-in-Asia, an area then mostly ruled by Ottoman and Seljuk Turks. It is mentioned in *BD* 1026 as a land to which the Duchess of Lancaster would not have sent an admirer on an irksome or futile mission (cp. *Alysaundre, Carre Nar, Drye See, Pruyce, Tartarye* I, *Walakye*). In *CT* A 66 it is a pagan (Moslem) country where the Knight had fought (cp. the Turkish towns of *Lyeys, Palatye, Satalye*).

Chaucer's form is French, based on Med. Lat. *Turchia* or *Turquia,* a regional name based on OFr. *Turc,* Med. Lat. *Turcus* "Turk" of unknown origin; see NED s.v. "Turk."

V

VALENCE in *PF* 272 is the name of some sheer (*subtyl*) fabric used for kerchiefs and is presumably based on the name of the town of Valence on the Rhone (dép. Drôme), France. For the name of other materials based on place names or defined by them see *chalon, Reynes*, and *Tars*.

The Latin town-name *Valentia*, based on the gentile name *Valentius*, here represented is exceedingly common and is, for instance, identical with Valencia in E Spain; the present town is mentioned by Pliny and was also known in antiquity as *Julia Valentia* and *Valentia Segovellaunorum*, also shortened to *Segalaunorum* (Holder II, 1451-52); see Gröhler I, 297-98.

VENYSE, Venice (Ital. *Venezia*, Fr. *Venise*, Germ. *Venedig*), Italy, is mentioned in *HF* 1348 (3, 258) to describe a ducat of very pure gold content; on Venetian gold ducats see *NED s.v.* "ducat," 1 and 1b. In *CT* E 51 *Venyse*, as *Venetia* in Petrarch (B & D 296, 8), is mentioned to indicate the point where the *Poo* empties through several mouths into the Adriatic; but by *Venetia* Petrarch (from whom Chaucer derives his statement) can only have been thinking in a most general way of the ancient territory of the *Veneti* (cp. his *Flaminia* under *Ferrare*, above,), perhaps that portion of the Lombard plain known as the Veneto, since he surely knew that none of the mouths of the Po flowed into the sea nearer than 35-40 m. S of the city of Venice. Whether Chaucer in imitating Petrarch knew this can scarcely be determined and is of trifling consequence.

The name of the town and region is based on the tribal (Venetic) name *Veneti*; Holder III, 160-67; Matthias 302-07. Chaucer's and the modern English form are French.

(MOUNT) VESULUS (Lat.) (var. M & R VI, 248, 249), Monte Viso or more commonly Monviso, NE Italy, highest peak (12,615 ft.) of the Cottian Alps, first climbed in 1861; this mountaineering achievement inspired the formation in the following year of the famous Club Alpino Italiano. Monviso, near the French frontier and about 42 m. SW of Turin, is mentioned in *CT* E 58 as having at its base (*roote*) the source of the *Poo*; it is also mentioned in E 47.

The name looks back to Lat. (*Mons*) *Vesulus*; Holder III, 261; *EI* XXXV, 455-56.

W

WALAKYE, Walachia or Wallachia (Med. Lat. *Walachia*, Fr. *Valachie*), an area between the Danube and the Transylvanian Alps in S Romania and since 1859 a part of Romania, was in Chaucer's day an independant Romanic-speaking kingdom which under Vladislav Bassarab (1364-74) accepted Hungarian overlordship. It is mentioned in *BD* 1024 as a region to which the Duchess of Lancaster would not have sent an admirer on an irksome or futile mission (cp. *Alysaundre, Carre Nar, Drye See, Pruyce, Tartarye* I, *Turkye*).

The name looks back to a Celtic stem *Volc-* (cp. Caesar's *Volcae*), yielding Germanic *Walh-* (see *Wales, MS* XVI, 150), first applied to Celts, including Britons, later to Romanic-speaking peoples of southern Europe. See *NED* under "Vlach," "walach," "Welsh," also *MS* VII, 129-30 under "Walache."

The Cistercian Everard of Ypres and His Appraisal of the Conflict between St. Bernard and Gilbert of Poitiers

NICHOLAS M. HARING S.A.C.

A NEW arrival in the history of mediaeval thought, the Cistercian Everard of Ypres, is such an interesting personality that the nature and range of his literary activities deserve a closer study. In the introduction to his *Dialogus Ratii et Everardi*, published in *Mediaeval Studies*, XV (1953), I noted that the *Dialogue* belongs to a group of three works arranged in the manuscript in the following order: a letter by Everard to Pope Urban III (1185-87), a *Dialogue* composed during the reign of Pope Celestine III (1191-98), and a letter to Everard written by a *frater B.*[1] Although I had no doubt that the "Athenian" Ratius in the *Dialogue* was a fictitious character, I wondered at the time of publication whether Everard was the author's real name or a pen-name to conceal the writer's identity.

In the present article I shall offer proof that Everard, one of the two principal interlocutors in the *Dialogue*, is indeed the author's actual name. This may appear obvious enough by the very fact that the second letter, just mentioned, is addressed to Everard as the author of the *Dialogue*, as well as of the letter to Pope Urban III. However, the style of the second letter might very well be presented in support of the view that it is a product of the same highly imaginative writer who assumed the name Everard. The *Dialogue* provides us with some information about the author's life and character. This information, as we shall see, is definite enough to identify him as the canonist of the same name who wrote a *Summula decretalium quaestionum.* It, too, furnishes some valuable complementary details about Everard's life. At the end of the article will be found the first edition of the two letters mentioned above. These are of doctrinal importance and contribute additional information on the author's life and surroundings.

I.

To judge from one biographical remark, Everard was "a monk and not a poet" when the discussion described in the *Dialogue* took place.[2] The letter addressed to him by a certain *frater B.* tells us that he had once been a *doctor egregius* and then became "by the grace of God a humble disciple of Christ" in the Cistercian Order. We learn from the *Dialogue* that, in his younger years, he had been "a cleric, in France, of his lordship Hyacinth, now Pope".[3] Cardinal Hyacinth, we know, was in France from 1162-65 and became Pope Celestine III in 1191.[4] The Everard of the *Dialogue* was well versed in canon law as may be gathered from several digressions into canonical topics.[5] He does not claim that he ever published a legal work but we do possess an unpublished *Summula decretalium quaestionum* composed by *Everardus natione Yprensis, professione monachus Clarevallensis, sed liberalium studio artium et disciplina scholari aliarum facultatum Parisiensis.*[6]

---

[1] N. M. Haring, "A Latin Dialogue on the Doctrine of Gilbert of Poitiers", *Med. Studies*, XV (1953), 243. The work will be quoted as *Dialogus.*

[2] *Dialogus*, p. 245: Cum itaque sim monachus et non poeta. . . .

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 248: Cum dicerem me fuisse clericum in Francia domini Hyacinthi, nunc Papae.

[4] Cf. R. Mols, *Dict. d'hist. et de géogr. eccl.* XII (1953), 64.

[5] *Dialogus*, pp. 250 and 265.

[6] Stephan Kuttner, *Rep. der Kanonistik* I (Vatican City, 1937), p. 187. Rheims, *Ms.* 689, fols. 1-74. Date: twelfth century.

This canonist, Everard by name, must be the same as the author of the *Dialogue*. The latter, it is true, does not tell us where he was born but on several occasions he betrays the fact that he was not particularly fond of France. He, too, was an "eminent teacher" in Paris who became a Cistercian at the end of his career. It is hard to believe that the Cistercians should have had in their midst two scholars of the same name and of the same background at the same time and at the same monastery. The canonist, as the *Summula* reveals, hailed from the Belgian city of Ypres, was a monk of Clairvaux by his religious profession and a Parisian by education. He wrote his canonical work *dum adhuc gymnasio insudaret scholastico.*[7] This, I suppose, means that he was not yet a Cistercian when he wrote it.

Since this *Summula* is dependent on the canonical *Summa* of Sichard of Cremona, written in 1179-81, the author certainly did not become a Cistercian before 1181. The fact that the introduction to the *Summula* speaks of *adjuvante igitur benigno Jesu* and the epilogue uses the expression *gratia benigni Jesu*[8] may here be cited to suggest the same atmosphere of piety as is expressed in Everard's letter to Pope Urban III: *Et benignus Jesus . . . det tibi fidei suae veritatem investigare et investigatam confirmare. Amen.* But there is much stronger evidence to identify the canonist with the author of the *Dialogue* whose name Everard was rather popular in Flanders.

The author of the *Dialogue* had likewise studied in Paris and then must have taught for a great many years before he entered the religious life. *Everardus insenuit studio litteraturae*, Sosias says in the *Dialogue.*[9] With a note of disapproval Sosias pities the aging Everard for having to farm the land with ignorant monks who would rather cut wood than discuss things theological.[10] Ratius, however, defends "brother Everard" because he was only imitating Christ's humility in giving up his former freedom and choosing the part of Mary rather than Martha. *Idem Parisius facere potuisset,* is Sosias' blunt reply, and the easiest explanation for that reply is that Everard had taught in Paris.[11]

He fulfilled his professorial office with distinction as is reflected in the letter in which he is addressed as *Doctori quondam egregio*. Perhaps, besides being a teacher, he was also a preacher, as Everard himself insinuates after listening to a long discourse made by Ratius. Everard voices the following comment: *Bene in tua digressione instruxisti praedicatorem dissertum atque philosophicum doctorem.*[12] This "philosophical doctor," or doctor of philosophy, had gone through training in the liberal arts, presumably also in Paris. To the reader of the *Dialogue* it is obvious that the student had become well acquainted with classical poetry in particular.[13] In fact, he became something of a poet himself and composed a brief epitaph on Gilbert's death in 1154.[14] His *Dialogue*, as we shall see, is often poetical and not a dry theoretical discussion; rather it is a refreshing mixture of humorous and serious debates that range from the influence of the moon on the weather to the subtleties of trinitarian problems. The very setting of the scene is a poet's, not a scholar's, idea. The *Dialogue* takes place while Everard and Ratius are sitting "at the foot of a shady hillock during harvest time". Ratius is "enraptured" by the delightful spot, a large meadow bordered by a lovely river with the slope of the hillock merging into the pleasant shade of a nearby forest.[15]

---

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 187.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 187.

[9] *Dialogus*, p. 287.

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] *Ibid.*

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 258.

[13] I avail myself of the opportunity to note that the verse: Ante pererratis amborum . . . Germania Tigrim (*Dialogus*, p. 268) is taken from Vergil, *Eclog.* I, 61 f. The reading *Axarim* of the manuscript is correct. The sentence: Non est in medico semper reveletur ut aeger (*Dialogus*, p. 282) is derived from Ovid, *Ep. ex Ponto* III, 15. It is also quoted by Simon of Tournai, *Disp.* XX, qu. 2; ed. J. Warichez (Louvain, 1932), p. 68.

[14] *Dialogus*, p. 252.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 251.

The author of the *Summula* can hardly be expected to indulge in describing the beauties of nature, but Everard managed to satisfy his poetical urge in the epilogue in which we read: *Cum igitur gratia benigni Jesu . . . quam si gloriosissimi decretistae assistentes mense VII ferculis pomorum a frondosa arbore Gratiani decerptorum et salsamento diversarum summularum Johannis, Rufini et aliorum conditorum ventrem suum implerent.*[16] Such flowery language is strikingly in accordance with the style of the *Dialogue.*

Although Kuttner does not think very highly of the canonist Everard,[17] it is worth noting that, as the title suggests, the *Summula decretalium quaestionum* is not a straight exposition of doctrine but a series of questions and answers, a sort of dialogue. We have already noted that the *Dialogue of Ratius and Everard* contains several discussions on canonical topics.[18] These discussions display a more than ordinary knowledge of legal questions. The first of these is occasioned by the term *vindicta* which occurs in a description of patience given by Ratius. It leads to a remark on the repelling of force *cum moderamine inculpatae tutelae.*[19] Ratius accepts it as a *regula juris fori, non poli,* which, as he explains, means that it holds as a rule of general law, not as a rule of the Gospel which teaches the suppression of vindictiveness, though not of anger.[20] Getting angry at somebody's injustice, we are told, is a matter of nature and therefore lawful, but no private person, let alone a monk, is allowed to retaliate. Hence the "control of one's hands" is a virtue, though this is not always true of the control of one's mind. Only a judge acting officially can order retaliation for an injustice.

Everard then wonders whether a judge may do so for an injustice he has suffered personally. Ratius replies that, being a public person, a judge may do so, provided the culprit be under his jurisdiction. Everard keeps questioning: Could a prelate have a procurator handle such a case if he cannot be present personally? The interlocutor gives him a summary of the pertinent legislation as found in Gratian's *Decretum*. Reverting to the judge who suffered personal injustices, the Cistercian now wants to know whether the judge can act if he alone knows of it. Ratius distinguishes: if his knowledge is based on a confession, an imposed penance should suffice; if his information is derived from other sources, several procedures may be followed according to the status of the accused, provided that the accusation can be proven.[21]

---

[16] Stephan Kuttner, *Repertorium,* p. 187. Another example of Everard's flowery, poetic style is found in the introduction where we read on fol. 1: Inde est quod in pelago Gratiani navigamus, infinitatem guttarum ipsius quasi Charybdim declinantes, anchoram nostram in portu paucitatis figimus et universitatem pluralitatis, immo infinitatis, ad commoditatem quandam quasi certam regulam reducentes, infinita singula non in singularibus sed in universalibus armario memoriae committimus, ut deinde necessaria promamus, ac si, summam retinentes, singula rejiciamus velut minus utilia. Adjuvante igitur benigno Jesu. . . . His epilogue (fol. 73ᵛ) begins as follows: Cum igitur gratia benigni et humilis humile hoc opusculum ad finem usque produximus et brevitati insistentes, levitatis commodum usquequaque observare nequivimus. Si populus nos sibilat de opere futili, immo quasi inutili, libenter toleramus. Vel forte in humilitate nostra latentes, nequaquam obtrectationibus eorum patebimus. . . . Nos itaque, more agrestium sub ficu nostra et sub frondosa minus quam vinifera sublatitantes vinea, fructus ejus in quiete comedemus nec vicinos aliquos invitabimus, timentes ingratorum ingratitudinem. Et minus caritate abundantes, refectioni esurientium hunc bottrum non exponere pro certo proposuimus. Si qui tamen esuriem Gratiani scientiae quaestionum fuerint passi, volentes assumere formam discendi ad (fol. 74) vineam nostram accesserint, non vineolam nostram proponemus nec eos intro admittemus uvas conculcaturos vel ramos confracturos. . . . He tells us that his work covers the subject matter of almost a three-year course: propter quod fere triennio in Gratiani pomerio laboratur: folia cum pomis quandoque immaturis colliguntur, quibus foliis ipsa tecta vix inveniuntur. Hic statim habebis, rejectis foliis, ficus praeparatoriorum quantum ad morum approbationem; secundo uvas judiciorum; tertio maturitatem omnium pomorum sacramentalium, si forte gratis tibi collatis grates velis dignas recompensare. . . .

[17] *Ibid.,* p. 190.

[18] *Dialogus,* pp. 250 and 265.

[19] *Ibid.,* p. 250: Omnes enim leges et omnia jura permittuntur vi repelli in continenti cum moderamine inculpatae tutelae. The reading "permittuntur" is a corruption of 'permittunt vim." The wording seems inspired by Stephen of Tournai, *Summa in Decretum* D. 1 c. 7; ed. J. F. Schulte (Giessen, 1891), p. 10: Vim enim vi repellere omnes leges et omnia jura permittunt cum moderamine tamen inculpatae tutelae. The expression "in continenti" occurs in Stephen's previous sentence. According to Stephan Kuttner, *Die Kanon. Schuldlehre* (Vatican City, 1935), p. 340, Stephen of Tournai was the first canonist to formulate the principle in this manner. See also the *Summa Parisiensis,* ed. T. McLaughlin (Toronto, 1952), p. 2. The teaching of Stephen of Tournai may also account for Everard's brief disgression into what he calls *actio unde vi* or *unde vi interdictum* (p. 265).

[20] *Dialogus,* p. 250.

The manner of handling and proving the various distinctions shows that the author of the *Dialogue* possessed a knowledge of canon law far superior to that of an intelligent theologian whose exposition might call for a digression into the teaching of canon law. A similar familiarity with the niceties of legal distinctions is manifest in the author's humorous discussion of *actio unde vi* or *interdictum*.[22]

Everard may have studied canon law in Paris,[23] but his years of training hardly confined him to that famous centre of learning. When Ratius boasts of having followed Gilbert of Poitiers from Chartres to Paris and from Paris to Poitiers, he is probably impersonating Everard.[24] When the same Ratius cites from the *Tegni* of Galen[25] or from the *Glossa super Johannitium* of a magister Bar (tholomaeus?),[26] Everard shows an acquaintance with medical works and the medical school of Salerno—the fashionable thing among some of the theologians of his day.

Everard was a highly gifted scholar who, like his contemporary, Peter Cantor, decided to spend his last days in a monastic community. It was no easy decision to make, because the monks did not live up to his expectations. He tells us that they gossiped, grumbled, whispered and indulged in backbiting, so much so that even "the father of monks", St. Bernard, was constrained to censure them publicly.[27] St. Bernard's example encouraged Everard to enlarge on their vices. St. Benedict, he informs us, had forbidden the monks to pass on information that had been picked up outside the cloister. But the very moment a guest arrives, whether he be an abbot or some other monk, they hold their little conventions. They sit around him and ask about the things he has seen and heard in the world, about vague rumours, about the princes of the world and the prelates of the churches. While the visitor is reporting, they keep silent and listen intently "because they keep their mouths shut". If someone dares to say a word about the divine services or the writings of the saints, they immediately storm at him. He is stigmatized as a quibbler, a controversialist, just as if he were a scoundrel, although there is not a law in the whole world which forbids the raising of questions in theology or morals and arguing about them.[28]

Everard has Ratius tell us that some of the monks consider as "barbarous" whatever smacks of fine distinctions and that some of the "black" monks surpass even the people of the world in their impatience, irritability, conceit and haughtiness. The monastic superiors in both white and black habits insist too much on the observance of their particular traditions, but care little about the Rule of St. Benedict, the practice of humility, the maintainance of fraternal peace. The monks, Ratius tells us, are touchy. You may criticize the emperor, the king, the pope and minor princes; they bear with it. But say a critical word about any of the monks, they will attack you indignantly. Why? Because, in their concealed pride, they are in love with their own superiority in the pharisaical belief that they are sanctified by the observance of their institutions.[29] Diplomatically enough, Everard does not agree with every detail of these accusations; yet even in his own surroundings he finds too much worldliness.

There is more than an ordinary amount of sarcasm in the following incident which he relates. While he and Ratius are debating, word reaches them that a dignitary has arrived unexpectedly. Taken by surprise, the monks alert the fishermen, who at once go to work and catch a pile of fish, big and small. One of them is a real "whopper" and truly worthy of such a great dignitary's stomach. It is quite a delight to the eyes when it finally appears on the table. Ratius listens carefully to the prelate's comment on the splendid dish, while others are standing around discussing various questions, disagreeing among themselves, but making sure they agree with the prelate's ideas.[30]

---

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 265.

[23] Kuttner, *Repertorium*, p. 188, interprets the remark *aliarum facultatum Parisiensis* in the sense that Everard studied canon law in Paris.

[24] *Dialogus*, p. 252.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 245.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 263.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 246.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 247.

[29] *Ibid.*

Ratius feels sorry for Everard who would sooner indulge in theological debates than in good meals. But, all in all, Everard is convinced that a monk's life has its compensations which make it far more preferable than the life most scholars lead, especially when it comes to the hour of death.[31] On the other hand, Everard is not exactly the pessimist that these and other stories may portray. He has a great sense of humour and a vivid imagination. To give an example: Ratius' companion, Sosias, is badly kicked in the back by a horse just in time to prevent Ratius from continuing his journey. As a result the debate can go on. During the prolonged sojourn Ratius prospers and gains weight enjoying the abbot's cuisine, as he is told by his servant Byrria, who notes that, at the same time, their horses are getting tamer and weaker on the monastic diet, because the monks are much more interested in the departure than in the feeding of those horses.[32]

II.

If we keep in mind that Ratius, Sosias, and Byrria are only fictitious characters and that their criticism is largely accepted, shared and even added to, by Everard, we are better prepared to understand the peculiar part played by Everard in debating the main topic of the *Dialogue* between Ratius and Everard, viz., the *causa magistri Gilleberti Pictaviensis episcopi.*[33] Everard was an ardent and capable follower of Gilbert of Poitiers. The fact that he entered the monastic community which revered St. Bernard as its founder did not change his adherence and loyalty to "Gilbert's cause". He tells us through Ratius that he had followed Gilbert until the end of the Bishop's life. At Chartres he was one of four students who attended Gilbert's classes. In "the Bishop's Hall" at Paris he was one of an audience of three hundred. He went with Gilbert to Poitiers (1142), but mentions here only that Gilbert taught him Latin and that in return Ratius instructed Gilbert in Greek.[34]

It seems that Gilbert's episcopal obligations prevented him from continuing his lectures, but they did not interrupt his scholarly pursuits. In all likelihood it was during this period that Gilbert wrote his commentaries on the Boethian *Opuscula Sacra* which were to stir up so much controversy. It is, however, not as preposterous as it may appear when Everard claims to have taught Gilbert Greek. The Bishop was well advanced in years at that time, but needed a better knowledge of the language to cope with the Greek terms and sentences in the *Opuscula Sacra*. On the other hand, Gilbert was well equipped to teach Latin, a language which he mastered to a degree far beyond the rules of ordinary syntax. However, if Gilbert's handling of the Greek in the *Opuscula* is any indication of what he was taught, Everard had little of which to be proud. And the knowledge of Greek exhibited by Everard in the *Dialogue* is definitely quite mediocre and derived from Latin sources.

---

[30] *Dialogus*, pp. 268 f.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 288.

[32] *Ibid.*, pp. 282 ff.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 251. In the introduction to the *Dialogue* (p. 245) I announced a separate study of the important analysis of Gilbert's doctrine given by Everard. The article was actually completed even before the publication of the *Dialogue* and sent, on request, to the *Miscellanea Lombardiana.* As I have dealt there with Everard's presentation of the grammatical, logical and philosophical premises of Gilbert's theological doctrines, it will be understood why no thorough explanation of those premises is attempted in this article.

[34] *Dialogus*, p. 252. On p. 248 Everard says to Ratius: In graeca et latina, hebraea quoque peritissimus es lingua. If autobiographical, the remark must be considered a gross exaggeration.

One may, of course, wonder how much fiction is mixed into Ratius' account. He begins his narration with the story that his mother *Ratio Atheniensis* sent him to France on the advice of his sister *Sophia.*[35] It appears to be a poet's way of saying that both reason and wisdom played a part in his decision to leave his native land for France. Whatever be the truth, Ratius speaks Everard's mind when he states that, if Gilbert had shone as brightly in Greece as he did in "garrulous France", his name would rightly have been more celebrated than that of "our Plato". But his heirs, we are told, were too indolent and idle, more interested in their meals and the appearance of vain glory than in true learning. As a result, we read, Gilbert had not yet been understood by his own followers, not to speak of outsiders: *Ipse enim ultra hominum fere evolavit intellectum.*[36]

Our Cistercian has Ratius tell us that St. Bernard also failed to fully understand Gilbert. Knowing theology and speaking of it, so we are told, are two different things. And again practical and speculative theology are two separate branches of the same discipline. Such men as St. Bernard, St. Martin, St. Benedict and several other saints, as Ratius claims, possessed the science of practical theology. How then, so the Cistercian wonders, could St. Bernard, a man without the science of speculative theology, accuse an outstanding theologian (*summum theologum*) of heresy? Ratius answers: *in hoc facto zelum Dei habuit.*[37] This sort of disagreement, he reassures us, should not disturb anyone, because such men as the great martyr Cyprian, Origen, Jerome and Gregory the Great, who contradicted Jerome, disagreed with others. The same is true with regard to certain statements made by *Magister Gillebertus*: what Blessed Hilary would have approved of did not seem true to Blessed Bernard. If we should charge Blessed Bernard with this lack of understanding, then we should charge much more the presumption and arrogance of those who induced him to disagree. They thought they grasped what they were unable to fathom and the Saint, guided by that charity which *believes all things* (*I Cor.* xiii, 7), believed them.[38]

Everard begs Ratius to illustrate how St. Bernard thought he grasped what he actually failed to understand. Ratius complies gladly and begins with the Saint's critique of Gilbert's explanation of the divine substance as *substantia qua est Deus.*[39] He concludes with his characteristic touch of sarcasm: *Habes igitur quam rationalis calumnia praedicto verbo fuit irrogata.*[40] "Easy! easy! on account of the Saint", Everard interjects. "But it seems", he goes on to say, "that Boethius can indeed be interpreted as you say." Ratius persists: "Does it not appear to you that the accusation against the master resulted from ignorance of the arts? Listen to what Pope Eugene said, 'How shall we judge what we do not understand? This man converses with God, not with men'. Mind you, Eugene says this speaking of the master."[41]

Everard then concedes that the reason for the controversy was the ambiguity of the word 'substance'. To give further examples, he submits to Ratius a few critical remarks that St. Bernard makes against Gilbert in his *De Consideratione.* Ratius explains how St. Bernard should have avoided these critical observations. Although Ratius does not openly contend that St. Bernard passed an erroneous judgment, Everard professes: *Boethium non audeo arguere erroris nec beatum Bernardum, cujus laus ubique praeconatur de summa theologia.*[42] The Cistercian does not betray the fact that in his exposition Ratius was extensively quoting from Gilbert, not Boethius. Before pointing to the wonderful *opuscula* written by St. Bernard, he touches on the Saint's education: *De quo* (i.e., St. Bernard) *vere praedicatur quod plura didicerit orando quam disputando et plura sub fago quam in disputationis areopago.*[43] But his opponent, Ratius, feels that there is no need of bringing up the Saint's name so often, because nobody intends to say anything against him personally. Only those are to be blamed who made false reports on the master. In his overflowing charity, which *believes all things,* the Saint took their word for it. Yet it is truly astonishing to see some monks rush, in thoughtless boldness, to the offensive against so great a teacher (*tanti doctoris*), while all the learned men of France acclaim the Bishop's writings: *excepta et salva auctoritate sancti Bernardi per omnia.*[44] "I am not sitting here", Ratius insists, "to defend Gilbert or accuse the Saint. I am just relating their assertions."

---

[35] *Ibid.*

[36] *Ibid.* According to John of Salisbury, *Hist. Pontif.*, 10; ed. R. L. Poole (Oxford, 1927), p. 23, Gilbert himself said during the trial: Fateor me plures habuisse discipulos qui me quidem omnes audierunt sed quidam minus intellexerunt.

[37] *Dialogus*, p. 272.

[38] *Ibid.*

[39] Cf. N. M. Haring, "The Case of Gilbert de la Porrée", *Med. Studies*, XIII (1951), 12.

[40] *Dialogus*, p. 274.

[41] *Ibid.* It is recorded by John of Salisbury, *Hist. Pontif.*, 10; ed. Poole, p. 22, that the Cardinals and most of the others who attended Gilbert's trial said: Numquam sic locutus est homo (*John* vii, 46). Everard does not claim that he was present at the Council of Rheims.

After citing a text wherein St. Bernard refers to the *duplex Deus* taught in certain circles, Ratius replies: *Hoc magister numquam excogitavit.*[45] Against St. Bernard's accusation that they also taught a God subject to a form, Ratius retorts: "I am truly at a loss how to answer, for it is a crime to assert that this Saint should have given expression to something contrary to the truth about oral or written statements of the master. Yet in the Bishop's sayings or writings nothing can be found that could be interpreted in that sense."[46] Ratius even finds fault with the textual accuracy of a quotation from Boethius, but excuses St. Bernard by saying that the Saint's manuscript must have been defective: *Igitur exemplar, in quo sanctus hoc legit, fuit liber mendosus aut scriptoris vitium.*[47]

Despite his previous resolve to leave St. Bernard's name out of the debate, Ratius keeps hinting at the Saint's misinterpretations of Gilbert's doctrine. In the above context, St. Bernard adds another Boethian text without attempting an explanation. Ratius shrewdly takes note of it: *Addit Bernardus de auctoritate . . . Sed non declarat. Magister autem declarat* . . . Here you have it, he concludes; God is not subject to a form because He is a Form as both Boethius and the Bishop teach. The Saint, however, seems to affirm that the Bishop held the opposite view.[48]

Ratius finally produces a long text in which the *pater monachorum*, as he calls St. Bernard, warns against subtle inquiries into the trinitarian mystery. Ratius is quite amazed: *Haec audiens vehementer obstupesco.* After all, St. Bernard himself did not act according to this admonition and Boethius states explicitly that he spent a long time investigating it. Is it really reckless to scrutinize the question how there is plurality in the divine unity, and unity in plurality? This is what "our philosopher" courageously asserted, truthfully taught, and what he maintained he knew how to prove, namely how there is one essence of three Persons and how the three Persons are of one essence.[49]

To conclude his long argument, Ratius adds a personal note: "And this is what I have often said when the occasion arose, 'Some monks, who are educated but not sufficiently trained in the scholastic method, simply transcribe in their books what they find expressed in the writings of the orthodox Fathers. But how these things are to be understood they neither know nor bother to learn from those who do know. Anyway, they believe that sinners cannot know what they, being saints, do not know themselves.' "[50]

[42] *Dialogus*, p. 272.
[43] *Ibid.*, p. 275.
[44] *Ibid.*
[45] *Ibid.*
[46] *Ibid.*
[47] *Dialogus*, p. 276.
[48] *Ibid.*
[49] *Ibid.*
[50] *Dialogus*, p. 277.

"If I may dare make a suggestion", Everard says breaking his long silence, "it seems to me that *in this particular point* Blessed Bernard judged more wisely than you and your master." Paying his interlocutor a somewhat dubious compliment, Ratius replies: "Everard, there are two vices you do not have—I wish it were true universally—viz., adulation and hypocrisy. Since this is the case, you should avoid the presumption of indiscreet and rash judgment because, as Horace says, while dodging vices, fools will run into the opposite evils." Our Cistercian accepts the reproach with good grace, for God, he says, has chosen the fools of this world to put to shame the wise.

Now it is Everard's turn to show that Gilbert went too far in trying to explain the trinitarian mystery. The monk had refrained from commenting upon the previous points of the debate in which Ratius refuted a number of passages from St. Bernard's *De Consideratione*. His silence gave consent. To prove the point at issue, Everard now cites some texts on the incomprehensibility of God and declares that Ratius' "philosopher" openly contradicts not only St. Gregory and "the great Denis", but even the words of Scripture:[51] "Hence he (i.e., Gilbert) understood more of God than other men or angels, things which our abbot, a true theologian, professed not to know like all the rest. Gilbert would indeed be like the beatified in heaven. How did your master know that which not even the angels grasp in all its fullness, since they fully comprehend neither God nor the Trinity? This you must tell me, this question you must solve. Then you will truly be my great Apollo."[52]

As one may expect by now, Ratius is equal to this challenge. But Everard does not really desire to speculate at length on faith and reason and reminds his friend of the basic issue: a reply to the abbot's correction of the master's exposition. Beginning with a text from Boethius, the salient point of the argument reads: *Pater, Filius, Spiritus sanctus non tres veritates sed una veritas est. Quod magister sic exponit: 'i.e. unus verus'. At Bernardus insultanter ait: Noster commentator melius dixisset 'i.e. veritas'.*[53] Coming from the lips of the Cistercian Everard, the word *insultanter* is no doubt the strongest expression of disapproval encountered so far. He now requests an elucidation of two questions: first, why the Bishop made such a comment and, secondly, why the Saint reprimanded the Bishop for making it.[54]

We may here return to the answer made by Ratius when he was asked to voice his view on some texts in St. Bernard's *De Consideratione*. Ratius answered: *Quid dicam? Nihil ibi positum invenio dignum*[55] *nodo. Magis enim est persuasorium quod ibi inducitur quam assertioni contrarium. Non est argumentatio sed ornata persuasio ad quosdam.*[56] In Ratius' opinion, Gilbert and St. Bernard did not speak the same language. As a preacher, we are told, St. Bernard might well express himself in figures of speech, "in tropes of rhetorical colour", as Ratius puts it—but strict scholarship cannot afford such freedom because it is bound by different rules.

As previously noted, a detailed analysis of the grammatical theory which Ratius evolves to defend his Gilbert has been presented elsewhere. Its general outline can be presented as follows: Concrete nouns (body, animal, stone, etc.) directly signify a reality, abstract nouns (whiteness, length, truth, etc.) a form. Indirectly, concrete nouns signify a form, abstract nouns a reality. Adjectives (white, long, true, etc.) follow the same rule. It depends on their grammatical position whether their signification is direct or indirect. The (individual) subject is always that of which something is predicated; the (universal) form is that which is predicated. The sentence: "This body is white," means that this body is white by whiteness, its form. The sentence: "Whiteness is whiteness", means that whiteness makes white; it thus expresses the effect caused by whiteness. To say: "This body is whiteness", makes no sense, because this body is not produced by whiteness.

---

[51] *Ibid.*

[52] *Ibid.*

[53] *Dialogus*, p. 278.

[54] *Ibid.*

[55] The reading *digno* on p. 274 of the *Dialogus* is a typographical error.

[56] *Dialogus*, p. 274.

In theology the same rules of language apply analogically. When we say: "God is true", we mean that God is true by truth. When we say: "God is truth", we claim that the subject, God, is an effect caused by truth, as if truth made God to be God. What we actually mean to say—and therefore ought to say—is that God is true (by truth). For that reason Gilbert corrected Boethius (*Deus est veritas*) by adding: *i.e. verus*. Such, we learn, are rules of proper *locutio* or *lexis* which accepts the sentence: "God is true," and rejects as false the statement: "God is truth". They differ from the rules of *elocutio* or *rhesis* in oratory (*in oratoria facultate*), where figurative language is permissible and prevalent.[57]

Everard is quite surprised that Ratius makes such an elaborate effort to explain this matter. Why so much fuss about a question so easily solved? He even heaps abuse on Ratius who, in turn, demonstrates his own great power of repartee. Another long discourse by Ratius enlarges on the rules of proper *dictio* and the differences and changes of meaning in the analogical application to God and the Trinity.[58] Returning to the conflict between St. Bernard and Gilbert, Ratius sums the matter up as follows: *Quod igitur in oratorio genere orandi i.e. loquendi episcopus verum esse judicavit, vester abbas in omni loquendi genere et facultate recipiendum approbavit.*[59] To make sure the difference is clearly understood, he repeats the principal points and concludes: *Diversa igitur qualitas orandi peperit interpretationis illius phantasiam. Quod enim secundum rhesim tantum judicavit episcopus Pictaviensis verum, secundum lexim et rhesim abbas Clarevallensis judicavit accipiendum. Quod enim unus tropice dictum putavit, alter proprie.*[60]

"Tell me now whether you are satisfied", Ratius enquires. "Almost" is the terse response he receives from Everard. Effusive as he is, Ratius gives us another summary and, feeling tired, prepares to depart with a last admonition to doubt no more the things he has clarified. Everard, however, refuses to allow him to go. At this moment Ratius' servant, Byrria, quite out of breath, arrives to inform his master that a messenger, sent by his wife, wishes to see him. Sosias, Ratius' uncle, still limping, also joins them. Byrria fails to see any sense in such time-wasting debates: *Cum Gallo gannis hic de Gallorum nugis.*[61] We have previously noted that Everard cannot conceal a certain rancour at the *garrula Francia*, as Ratius had expressed it in the earlier part of the dialogue.[62]

Ratius now breaks off the discussion to see the messenger and look after the horses so sorely neglected by the monks. He assigns to Sosias (*qui sedatum habet cerebrum*) the task of carrying on the debate until he returns. Everard resents this "illiterate layman" until Ratius reassures him that Sosias is well qualified to continue the discussion. It centres on the definition or description of truth, which, at first, leaves Everard less satisfied.[63] By the time Ratius returns, the principal items of the *Dialogue* are again gone over. "Is your question solved, brother Everard"? Ratius enquires. *Est utique plene et plane sed nec leviter nec breviter*, is the reply.[64]

So the Cistercian is fully satisfied with the result of their investigation in which Ratius won every argument. There is, in fact, not a single instance of any importance in which St. Bernard's cause emerges victorious over that of the Bishop of Poitiers. As a good and loyal Cistercian Everard sides with St. Bernard to a point and tones down the occasionally abusive language which he could have cancelled by a stroke of his pen. But he is too much the dramatist to forego such devices to stimulate the interest of his readers or audience. Thus, in its kind, the *Dialogue* is unique. It could have been performed on a stage and for a very mixed audience, because it contains enough variety to make a lay brother chuckle and a theologian marvel at the spirited presentation of such highly controversial problems. Involving the person of their founder, the treatment added a very personal note to the solution, which the "playwright" wished to be accepted with a minimum of reflection on the Saint who had so vigorously opposed them. For there can be no doubt that, not only deep in his heart but also with open manifestation, Everard was a convinced *Porretanus.* He felt it to be his duty to enlighten first of all the religious community where opposition to Porretanism was more than an abstract disagreement.

---

[57] Cf. *Dialogus*, pp. 278 f.

[58] *Dialogus*, pp. 280-282.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 282.

[60] *Ibid.*

[61] *Dialogus*, p. 283.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 252.

[63] *Ibid.*, pp. 284 f.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 285.

Everard tells Ratius to pray for Gilbert instead of shedding useless tears. Ratius, however, considers even prayers unnecessary for a man who "is believed to be close to the secrets of God in the palace of heaven." "I do not grieve", he continues, "because of anything that has happened to *him* but because of what has happened to *us* and the whole world which is unworthy of his doctrine. He was in truth the proverbial well-watered fountain of which no stranger partook and in which even his own flock shared only to a moderate degree."[65] Everard is so moved by this eulogy that he pours out his heart in greater love for a beloved friend: *Cum ab antiquo mihi fueris dilectus, propter dilectionem illius magni ex dilecto factus es mihi amplius praecordialis et individuus.*[66] Ratius had practically 'canonized' Gilbert and his Cistercian friend loves him so much the more for extolling the greatness of a man whose very name conjured up suspicions of heresy, at least among the followers of St. Bernard. Toward the end of the *Dialogue* when Sosias asks Ratius: "Do you want me to teach this indignant Minerva"? (i.e. Everard), the Cistercian does not wait for an answer from Ratius and declares: *Audiam te libenter quia audio te novisse doctrinam doctoris nostri.*[67] Thus Everard explicitly admits what is only poorly concealed, viz., that he belongs to the flock "of that great man" and is ready and willing to listen to any one who professes to know the doctrine of "our teacher".

To safeguard the reputation of St. Bernard, Everard draws up three lines of defence: first of all, the Saint was misled by others in whose judgment he trusted out of that charity which, in the words of the Apostle, believes all things. Secondly, we are given to understand that St. Bernard was a man of practical, not speculative theology, and who, as Ratius phrases it, had learned more by prayer than debate, more under a beech tree than on the Areopagus of disputation.[68] Being insufficiently trained, "he did not fully understand master Gilbert" *quia, ut dicitur, juvenis a studio artium prudenter indoctus recessit, in qua aetate ad theologiam audiendam non ad aliquem doctorem accessit.*[69] The suggestion that the grace of God made up for the Saint's lack of scholastic training is a little too much for Ratius: *Hoc forte monachis suis persuadebis, at non mihi.*[70] We must not lose sight of the fact that Ratius is a fictitious Greek who says exactly what Everard wants to hear.

The third line of defence grows out of the second. St. Bernard, we are told, excelled in a different field of literary activity[71] and clung to the erroneous opinion that whatever is allowable in the language of preachers and *in moralibus theologicis* (to quote Ratius) is equally permissible in the language of speculative theology. Even the Fathers, we learn, did not always conform to the strict standards of scientific speech.[72] Everard shows no strong signs of reaction when Ratius claims: *Nota unicuique artifici in sua facultate credendum ut logico in logica, geometrae in geometria, et fabro in fabrateria et theologo in theologia. Sed iste sanctus, de quo est sermo, nullius artis artifex inventus, in artibus exercitatus parum, in quaestionibus theologicis nihil, in moralibus vero theologicis multum.*[73]

---

[65] *Dialogus*, p. 252.

[66] *Ibid.*

[67] *Dialogus*, p. 284.

[68] *Ibid.*, p. 275.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 271. John of Salisbury, *Hist. Pontif.*, 12; ed. Poole, p. 27, tells how St. Bernard asked him to arrange a meeting for him with Gilbert to discuss some obscure texts in St. Hilary of Poitiers. Gilbert refused, because he considered St. Bernard's scholastic training insufficient: Ille vero respondit jam satis esse quod hucusque contenderant et abbatem, si plenam intelligentiam affectaret, prius in disciplinis liberalibus et aliis praedicendis plenius instrui oportere.

[70] *Dialogues*, p. 272. John of Salisbury, *Hist. Pontif.*, 11; ed. Poole, p. 27, also says of St. Bernard: Sed non creditur scripsisse aliquid quod non fidei zelus et charitatis fervor expresserit.

[71] John of Salisbury, *Hist. Pontif.*, 12; ed. Poole, p. 27, puts the same distinction as follows: Erant tamen ambo optime litterati

Ratius undoubtedly represents the critics of St. Bernard in the school of Gilbert. Everard shows his agreement with them, in most cases, by his silence or by the sort of query he makes either to prolong the debate or draw attention to implications in need of clarification. The fact that he is thoroughly defeated by Ratius causes no bitterness, because he wanted to lose the argument so that his beloved Gilbert would be the real victor. In the eyes of Everard the Council of Rheims (1148) was a test of strength in which St. Bernard was successful in bringing him to trial and unsuccessful in convicting him of heresy. This is expressed in the form of a question addressed to Ratius: *Quomodo tuum magistrum in pleno Remensi Concilio, ne dicam convincere, sed de haeresi convenire praevaluit?*[74] After presenting a long argument to prove that it is wrong to say *Deus est divinitas*, Ratius pauses for his opponent's comment, because this contention ranked first among the charges made against Gilbert at the Council of Rheims. But Everard is so satisfied and pleased that, "to tell the truth", he cannot think of a single objection: *Sufficienter et satis rationabiliter et, ut verum fatear, non est quid refragari debeat. Restat tamen, ut respondeas argumentis et rationi beati Bernardi, qui nunc est vere et juste in catalogo sanctorum, cujus assertioni auctoritatem addit spectata et approbata sanctitas fere a cunctis.*[75]

Everard, we may recall, did not suffer from the vices of adulation and hypocrisy. So he is not afraid to go so far as to assert that St. Bernard's holiness is recognized "almost by all". He is, likewise, not afraid to pass some critical remarks on the Bishop of Poitiers. His memory of that "most exalted man and most penetrating philosopher" was impaired by Gilbert's excessive pride: "He despised human praise and glory more than is just. For that reason he refused to step down to the level and capacity of a larger audience."[76]

But Gilbert of Poitiers is really Everard's hero. We are told by Ratius that Gilbert fully grasped the mind of the Greek and Latin philosophers, clearly understood the faith of the Greek and Latin Fathers: *In subtilitate altius caput omnibus extulit.*[77] He who reads his works *duce Spiritu intellectus* profits more in every respect than he who reads the entire works of all the others. And since the possession of Gilbert's works is dearer to Ratius than all the fabulous wealth of Croesus, he has hidden them away in his library in Athens.[78] This probably means that Everard had to part with them when he entered the monastic community which had special reasons to look with disapproval upon the reading of such highly controversial books. However, Everard's numerous and literal

---

et admodum eloquentes sed dissimilibus studiis. Abbas enim . . . praedicator erat egregius.

[72] *Dialogus*, p. 270.

[73] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 272.

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

[76] *Ibid.*, p. 251. That Gilbert must have been a very independent and proud man can be gathered from an incident told by John of Salisbury, *Hist. Pontif.*, 11; ed. Poole, p. 24. Pope Eugene volunteered personally to make erasures and changes in Gilbert's text. With words of due respect the Bishop of Poitiers refused the Pope's offer and concluded with the request: Vos potius praescribite quid eradi oporteat et ego mandatum vestrum sedulus adimplebo. As a result not a word was altered as I have shown in the introduction of the critical edition of Gilbert's commentaries on the first two *Opuscula Sacra* in *Studies and Texts* I (Toronto, 1955), p. 25.

[77] *Dialogus*, p. 252.

[78] *Ibid.*

quotations from Gilbert's commentaries on the *Opuscula Sacra* prove that he had access to the volume. We know, in fact, that the library of Clairvaux owned at least two copies of the commentaries, one of which is still preserved at the Bibl. Nationale of Paris (*Ms lat.* 18094), and the other at the Municipal Library of Troyes (*Ms lat.* 1841). They were placed side by side, as the shelf marks (G. 74 and G. 75) reveal, and since both of them belong to the twelfth century, it is not impossible that one of them once belonged to our Everard.

III.

Our description of the complex personality of the Cistercian Everard, who refused to sacrifice his loyalty to Gilbert of Poitiers on the altar of his religious vows, is an important key to the understanding of a letter he addressed to Pope Urban III (1185-7). This letter is published at the end of this study and deals "with some articles of faith". According to the title of the letter three problems are dealt with: the Assumed Man, the two natures and one Person in Christ, and the "characteristic" (i.e., trinitarian) properties. In the letter itself this order is reversed. The author, who is named Everard in the title of the letter, turns to the Pope *a finibus terrae* and is deeply concerned about the increase of worldliness which threatens the very foundations of the faith. The introduction which praises Urban's name as *admirabile in throno regiae potestatis, admirabile in tribunali judiciariae discretionis* points to a man familiar with legal terms. The introduction also reflects a man who is familiar with the numerous requests addressed to the Head of the Church: some asking for help, others for redress of injustices, others for honours. They all seek their own advantage, all want temporal favours. The Law of Justinian "clamours noisily" and the *immaculate Law of the Lord* is silenced.[79]

Everard had probably learned a great deal about such matters when he was in the entourage of Cardinal Hyacinth. But he is more deeply worried about certain errors in theology taught and learned in Paris and elsewhere. Speaking of the Trinity, some say: *paternitas est Deus*, while others say: *paternitas non est Deus.* Both cannot be right and those who are wrong must be corrected.[80] Most of the argument which follows agrees verbatim with the treatment of the same problem in the *Dialogue.*[81] Long passages are directly copied from Gilbert's comment on Boethius' *De Trinitate*, though Gilbert's name is never mentioned. No doubt, this silence was a matter of expediency. A textual comparison between the *Dialogue* and the letter to Urban seems to be in favour of the view that this part of the letter is based on the *Dialogue*, because the text quotations in the latter are more explicit and more accurate. However, the external evidence shows that the letter was written in 1185-7 and the *Dialogue* in 1191-8. The purpose of the first part of the letter may be obscure to a less discerning reader: the writer intends to prove that the sentence: *paternitas non est Deus* is correct. In other words, Everard wants Rome to side with the *Porretani.*

In the second part of the letter Everard sets out to show that the Parisian faculty of theology—*nostri Parisienses*—teaches semi-Nestorianism.[82] Though they do not say so in so many words, "our Parisians" teach that there are two persons in Christ.[83] Here again Everard's basic ideas are borrowed from Gilbert of Poitiers.

With regard to Christ's nature(s), with which he deals in the third part of the letter, Everard contends that some Parisians—*quidam Parisienses*—profess semi-Eutychism despite Pope Alexander's prohibition.[84]

---

[79] *Epistola Everardi,* 1-2. The *Epistola* is edited at the end of this study. The numbers refer to the chapters into which I have divided the letter to facilitate references to it.

[80] *Epist. Everardi,* 3.

[81] The references to identical texts in the *Dialogue* will be found in the footnotes to the text.

[82] *Epist. Everardi,* 13.

[83] *Ibid.,* 10.

[84] *Ibid.,* 17.

"These, Father, are errors which, originating in Paris, are being spread almost across the entire world."[85] Only the Pope, as the writer tells us, can settle the issue "because old men are reluctant to renounce what they learned in their youth."[86] "Father", Everard pleads later, "You have heard those errors when you went to school and lived among those erring people."[87] Our Cistercian then adds up the errors, but not without adding a few more arguments. Finally he goes so far as to tell Pope Urban to forget temporal questions for the time being and to organize and attend weekly theological disputations (to be held in his presence) rather than take a rest. Then, he adds, the Pope should write to the "Parisians" and define his position and denounce the erring theologians to the clergy.[88] No doubt, Everard believed in frankness.

Another Cistercian, of whose name we only know the initial *B*, read and re-read both the *Dialogue* and the letter to Urban. He finally decided to write to "brother Everard" to express not only the pleasure but also the difficulties these two writings had caused him. Both his style and his depressed outlook on the depravity of the world at large will remind the reader of Everard, though "brother *B*" is even more critical. Believing that the end of the world is at hand, he takes it for granted that the people living in the world have opened "the gate to all evils".[89] The members of the various religious Orders differ from them only by their dress or habit. They are like trees in the fall: just leaves and no fruit. "Leave all those people", Everard is told, "and lift up your eyes to Mount Sion, I mean the Order of Orders, our Order". It will make you weep to see how *the foxes have walked upon it*.

Then "brother *B*" paints a gloomy picture of his Cistercian confreres and concludes by saying that his description of their numerous faults is really superfluous, because Everard has "pierced through such human monsters sufficiently and abundantly with a certain biting elegance."[90] In approaching the main subject of his letter, the writer warns: *De medio fiat omnis iniqua suspicio, facessat indignatio, rancor omnis absistat.* It sounds like an echo of repercussions which must have followed the publication of the *Dialogue*. "I do not come to you as a tempter" but as a brother and friend. To save Everard the trouble of looking up his *Dialogue*, "brother *B*" transcribed the entire passages which remained either obscure to him or incomplete and contradictory. He is not afraid to censure some points and to propose such solutions as he considers more satisfactory. At one point he openly declares that he cannot follow Everard's explanation of a text by St. Hilary: *Satisfaciat ad hoc Ratius tuus, immo ratio tua.*[91] The remark indicates that at least this reader of the *Dialogue* realized that Ratius was a fiction, a personification of "Reason".

"Brother *B*" then examines certain passages from the letter to Urban III and requests a more lucid and complete explanation of a Boethian text which he compares with statements from Sts. Ambrose and Augustine that appear to contradict Boethius. The letter ends on a friendly, humorous note: "What do you think, my brother Everard? You imagined that all was so quiet that you could rest soundly on your ears. *Homer sometimes nods*, but I do not blame you for getting caught napping during such a long piece of work." The writer wishes to be excused, if he has caused any inconvenience, though he feels that he has presumed on a true friend, not a stranger.[92]

Who wrote the letter? The answer would seem easy enough: a Cistercian whose name begins with the letter *B*. However, I cannot help suspecting that it was born in Everard's poetical fancy, because the style is so remarkably similar to that of the *Dialogue*. It may well be based on actual enquiries made by another

---

[85] *Ibid.*, 18.

[86] *Ibid.*

[87] *Epist. Everardi*, 19.

[88] *Ibid.*, 20-22.

[89] *Epistula fratris B.*, 1. See note 79, *supra*.

[90] *Ibid.*, 3.

[91] *Ibid.*, 8.

[92] *Ibid.*, 14.

Cistercian and, in that case, Everard did not have to invent a Greek critic. The fact that the three writings were copied and inserted in a large volume containing works by men of such illustrious names as Anselm, Ivo of Chartres, Rupert of Deutz, Hildebert of Le Mans, Hugh and Richard of St. Victor, shows that they were not considered to be without merit. Indeed, today they are of more than ordinary interest for the history of what is called Porretanism in which so much is left to be clarified. No author is known to have analyzed Gilbert's position with the thoroughness of our Cistercian. We have touched only in passing the grammatical theories, a knowledge of which is really indispensable to any sensible explanation of certain assertions which brought upon Gilbert and his school the suspicion or accusation of heresy.

IV.

We have, so far, analyzed the works, character and method of a scholar who deserves attention as a theologian and canonist and, strange as it may seem, as a dramatist. It should be left to a more competent judge to determine his place in the history of the theatre. His *Dialogue*, an attentive reader will not fail to note, is much more than a dry sequence of questions and answers. It contains descriptions of nature, changes of scenery, movements of characters. The participants may sit in the grass on the hillside or take refuge under a roof on the following day to be protected from the rain foreseen the previous evening, but they will always remain close enough to the monastery to hear its bell ring. In thus establishing the unity of place, Everard apparently thought that the open air was the best symbolic setting for an open discussion. The succession of questions and answers, occasionally interrupted by Ratius' companions and Everard's confreres, is never dull, always stimulating, often witty and humorous, sometimes slightly impolite and rude.

Here is a sketch of the development we can easily visualize on a stage: Everard is walking about, meditating on the monastic life, when his friend, the Athenian Ratius, a man of manly spirit and excellent education, steps into his path with a joke on his lips: *Frater Everarde, studiis accingere tarde. Nescio quid tecum grave cornicaris inepte.* Everard throws back his head: *Rati, optato advenisti sed non optato incepisti.*[1] The Cistercian does not miss the pun on (*Eve*)*rarde* and *tarde* and retorts: *optato advenisti, non optato incepisti.* He resents the quotation from the Satirist Persius and rejects it with the same poetical ease: *Non cornicor inepte sed meditor apte.* "I was only joking", Ratius remarks and tells the monk that his meditating must be pretty useless if he cannot even see and take a joke. Everard replies with a verse from Persius, and Ratius, the Greek, meets it with a sentence from "our Galen" to show that too much study "dries up a man". They argue back and forth until Ratius asks the Cistercian on what he was meditating. "I should like to tell you", Everard answers, "because I am anxious to be instructed by you, since I know you taught at the Areopagus. But, unfortunately, I am not free, the bell is calling me to the evening service. Yet I am afraid that, being a guest, you will not stay with us." "Don't worry", Ratius reassures him, "go and return quickly."

While walking away Everard says to himself: "I will tell him everything I think of the monks, no matter what Order they belong to or what habit they wear. I will talk to him frankly, not in order to run others down but to get over my doubt".

They are together again and Ratius begins the conversation: *Dic, Everarde, si quid habes.*[2] "I have something against you", the monk replies. "It is against the rule to address me with my simple name without adding anything to it". "Don't waste your time", the Greek objects. "I have nothing to do with your rules".

---

[1] *Dialogus*, p. 245.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 246.

The technicality of proper address removed, Everard goes straight to the point. How do you account for the lack of harmony between the regular and conventual monastic institution and the general deplorable drift of their daily conversation? How do you explain "the great discord between the monk's holy profession, his exterior habit and interior attitude"? Since St. Bernard denounced them publicly, the Cistercian feels that he cannot be wrong by enquiring. But Ratius shrugs it off: "Am I a monk to pass judgment on their mores? *Tractent fabrilia fabri*". "You are a true monk by virtue and attitude, though not by profession and habit", is Everard's astonishing answer. "You are talented enough to advise any monk of any Order".

Ratius shies away from the subject with another verse of Horace: *Caelum, non animam, mutat qui trans mare currit.*[3] "You Greeks are all alike in your evasiveness", the Cistercian retorts. So Ratius decides to listen to his complaint about the monks who ignore St. Benedict's rule not to relate in the cloister the things heard in the world. Ratius is only too willing to add fuel to the fire, but carefully notes that his criticism does not include the "white" monks (Cistercians). Everard agrees, if only to a point, and then alludes to an argument with a certain monk by the name of Hugh "who appeared to be most religious in manner and dress, and highly recommended for his education and conduct".[4] The Cistercian readers probably knew exactly to whom he referred, but they had to wait for details because Ratius is now in full course and gives us a piece of his mind on monks, clerics, and prelates. He maintains that the humble and repentant sinners of the world are the really happy people whereas "you, brother Everard, and the others like you are miserable, swelling up in angry denunciation of the life of the religious." That is exactly what our Cistercian wanted to hear: *Benedictus sit sermo oris tui.*[5]

"I know you inside out", Ratius boasts with Persius, "but tell me more about that Hugh". "Not until you promise me to keep it to yourself", is the monk's warning, a warning which Ratius deems a superfluous precaution among men of prudence. Everard describes the unpleasant incident and Ratius advises him it would have been better for him to remain silent. Not fully convinced, Everard insists that he just could not tolerate the dogmatic manner in which such an entire stranger as Hugh presumed to read his thoughts. "Perhaps he noticed your arrogance or somebody else told on you", Ratius explains mercilessly. "But what happened after that"? Everard has a long memory and hits back: "Just what happened to you when we first met here. Like you he had to admit that what he heard from me or about me was better than he thought". "That's indeed true with you", Ratius agrees sarcastically, and abruptly takes leave to prepare his departure on the next day.[6]

The monk grows a little impatient: "You told the abbot (*papae*) you would stay with us for a while. You have not even touched the question I wanted you to answer. That is exactly what the Greeks will do: they will either suddenly drop a discussion or leave things half done." Ratius does not ignore the gibe: "You Latins love to chat with the Greeks, you who are merely small rivulets that come from the fountain-well of the Greeks. Yet you are all as ungrateful as your Virgil with his *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.*" "Let's forget it, for poetry is poetry", the Cistercian pleads. "You need not humour me", Ratius retorts, "because I am a patient man. I wish you were as patient and meek as I am".

Everard cannot help making a personal comment which sheds an interesting light on his character: "Now that you mention patience, tell me what patience is, because the brethren often admonish me of its need". Ratius can neither suppress a suspicion nor resist the challenge and for a long time they quarrel about the definition, or rather description, of patience.[7] After a wordy exposition by Ratius, Everard grumbles: "Old stuff" (*trita teris*). But Ratius warns him: "Not only do you not blush when you are beaten, you even belittle my argument just to have something to say. Now tell me why I should put the word *vindicta* in place of *ira* in the description of patience I have given". Ratius stands his ground well. He knows his Gratian and makes liberal use of this knowledge.[8]

---

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] *Dialogus*, p. 247.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 248.

[6] *Ibid.*

Voices are heard calling on Ratius to return. The Cistercian begs him to stay because it is late in the day. "I will not stay here another night", Ratius rejoins with determination. Everard offers to accompany him to the gate and reminds him that the debate on patience is not yet finished: "And there is something else left to be discussed". Ratius is curious: *Quid hoc fuit*? "Well", the Cistercian continues, "the monk called Hugh, whom I mentioned before, withdrew his verdict on me the following day and asked me about master Gilbert, Bishop of Poitiers, who denies that God is His essence or His divinity and such like".[9]

Ratius has hardly finished telling him to pass the matter over in silence when he notices a commotion among his horses. Then a servant comes limping along "on three legs instead of his usual two." Everard is sorry to hear that poor Sosias was kicked by a horse and suffered a fractured backbone. Ratius takes the opportunity to remind the monk that the impatience of the brute animal is, by way of contrast, a good illustration of their discussion on patience. He then orders his servants Byrria and Davus to attend to Sosias and ready the horses for their departure. "My master", Davus remonstrates, "we will have to wait two weeks if you expect Sosias to be with us". "Do you hear that, Everard"? Ratius is heard saying and Everard admits that he is at once sorry for the servant and glad of the delay.

Instead of retiring to the hostel (*hospitium*), as suggested by Ratius, they go and sit down on the grass on the hillside. It will be a long session, because Everard still insists on the solution of his question concerning Gilbert and does not want to enter the boundary of the monastery lest he be detained by the sound of the bell. As they sit there, the bell rings but they do not move. Everard urges his friend to make haste and Ratius complies, beginning with a nostalgic account conjured up by his memory of that great man and philosopher Gilbert. "I hear you attended his lectures", Everard interrupts him after a while. Ratius grows more and more eloquent in his praise until Everard feels that Ratius went far enough. "Don't shed such irrational tears", he grumbles with apparent irony and admits soon after that now he likes Ratius much more because he sees that Ratius is so fond of Gilbert.[10]

The Greek improvises a short prayer to the Spirit of wisdom which the monk concludes with a pious *Amen*. Before long Ratius is deep in grammar and logic paving the way for an understanding of Gilbert's theology. After some five or more minutes Everard interrupts him: "My Lord, where are you going? I think you are rambling too much". Ratius: *Docendus viam viatorem doces*? *Rudis theologus rudimenta ad theologiam audire non potes*? "You ignorant theologian cannot even listen to the basic preamble of theology"?[11] Everard agrees: "Go on, I will listen". Ratius launches on an even longer discourse. Then some lively questions and answers follow in rapid succession until three monks approach the two disputants. Everard whispers that they will disturb the debate unless Ratius does something to get rid of them. "I know", Ratius replies and turns to the undesired visitors: "Hello, brothers, have you heard the latest rumour from overseas"? "No we have not", one of them replies eagerly, "you have just come from there and you tell us". They walk right into the Greek's trap. "I am not a newcomer", Ratius protests, "but you go and hurry to the gate before the visitors

---

[7] *Dialogus*, p. 249.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 250.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 251.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 250.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 253.

I saw there get away on you". And off they go. The trick worked well but Everard is bothered by scruples which Ratius soon removes to his satisfaction. The debate continues and Ratius, as usual, does most of the talking.[12] He finally reminds Everard that the bell is ringing.

Longing for more debating of this kind the Cistercian begs: "Tomorrow, when the others are going to work, you must come here well prepared". They argue shortly over the term "prepared" and then Ratius agrees to return saying: "Wait for me here or rather close to your scriptorium in the orchard. The weather is getting worse on account of the new moon". On the next morning the conversation opens again with a short prayer and, as predicted by Ratius, bad weather forces them to sit under the roof of the scriptorium. Although it is just a roof resting on four poles it looks to the imaginative Greek like an *exedra*, a regular hall for discussion. So we can still observe them.

Curious as he is, Everard would first like to ask how on earth Ratius could forecast the weather so accurately. Ratius tells him that it is typical of the Latins to ramble in such pointless fashion. He treats the monk to a story about a professor in whose lecture the word "eye" occurred. The professor went on: "Having mentioned the eye, let us see what an eye is". His description of the eye, according to Ratius, proved that the professor knew his anatomy better than the grammar he taught. "One of your Priors", he informs the Cistercian, "blundered just as badly when, in a talk on God, he completely distorted a sentence from Porphyry. Of course, the Prior wanted to show off his knowledge of logic. "Your Horace" has rightly stigmatized such silly vanity when he wrote: *Et forte cypressum scit simulare*.[13]

Everard voices some faint disapproval: "You could have told us something worthwhile". Ratius concedes only that his stories were out of place, although they carry a lesson. The debate is then resumed with new vigour. Again Ratius dominates Everard with a long, rarely interrupted exposition of Gilbert's doctrine.[14] At long last Everard catches him in a dilemma and forces an answer. This device is carefully planned to avoid monotony and the argument leads to a brief discussion on the use of force. Everard shows some indignation at the fact that Ratius merely laughs instead of admitting his failure to get out of the dilemma. "You take me wrongly", the Greek protests. "I am laughing only because you are like an over-anxious hunting dog which, while chasing a wild boar, takes time off to dash for a rabbit that happens to turn up". Our disputants then forget about the law problem and return to their theology.[15]

As usual, the Cistercian throws his questions into Ratius' discourse to enliven it. Ratius is shocked when, after a long session, Everard wants to ask "just one more question". He gently reminds the religious: "The evening *synaxis*[16] is completed and you have not yet said Vespers. Any minute the bell will call you to supper. You surely spend more time on your study than on your evening office. So make it short". They go on and on. In the end Ratius gives up: "It's simply impossible to satisfy you. Listen, the supper bell is ringing. That's all; let's go". "Come back tomorrow", Everard begs, apparently in vain. Ratius is quite determined to leave but our Cistercian has the last word: "Now I know you are upset. All professors are like that. They fly into a rage when they get stuck. I really thought you would be above that and enjoy being contradicted to show your wisdom".[17]

At this point the news of the arrival of a high ecclesiastic reaches them and the author of the *Dialogue* tells the story about the fish dinner we have already described. Their mutual disgust at such sensuality brings our two disputants together again. Gradually the topic changes from Gilbert's teaching to St. Bernard's opposition to it.[18] Just before the transition the Cistercian makes the concession: "To tell the truth, there is nothing left to oppose it".[19] We have already described how this delicate problem is handled by the author. Naturally, by now we know what to expect of a Greek who is anything but a respecter of persons. At the end Ratius is thoroughly tired and wants to leave.

---

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 255 ff.

[13] *Dialogus*, p. 258.

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 259-264.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 265.

[16] Cf. *Rule of St. Benedict*, 17; PL 66, 460C: Vespertina autem synaxis quatuor psalmis cum antiphonis terminetur.

[17] *Dialogus*, p. 268.

Again Everard tries to hold him back, but without success. The servant Byrria comes rushing on the scene to announce the arrival of a messenger from Ratius' wife. Together with Sosias he had looked for his master all over the property and is completely out of breath. He complains about Ratius getting fat on the abbot's menu (*diaeta abbatialis*) while the horses, living on the monks' diet (*diaeta monachalis*), will soon be unable to carry a horseman. Then Sosias, still hobbling along with a fractured back, appears on the scene and confirms the shocking story about the treatment of their horses: "For the first or second night the monks will treat the horses like those of guests (*equi hospitum*). Then they are regarded not as horses of guests but of enemies (*equi hostium*), unless they belong to great and wealthy magnates. In that case their fear of authority, not their obedience to charity, makes them provide food in abundance."[20] "There is your often-vaunted charity", Ratius remarks to Everard as he proposes to leave to meet his wife's messenger and take better care of the horses· "Don't believe rumours", the Cistercian rejoins calmly, "but it is true that the servants of rich men often demand more food for their horses when they are in somebody else's stable". Ratius leaves Sosias behind to carry on the debate. It looks like a neat trick to cover up the fact that the author experienced greater difficulty in coping with the problem at hand, namely the definition of truth.[21] Much of what Sosias has to say is a repetition of earlier findings which are now applied to the concept of truth. There seems to be no direct connection with the chief subject of the debate.

Sosias takes the monk's queries rather badly and calls Everard "a fifth wheel on the monastery wagon". Ratius returns just in time to hear the monk's complaint about this insult. "It's our custom to make jokes like that", Everard is told by his Greek friend and old Everard understands and forgives. Sosias, however, insists that he was serious because Everard, he tells us, is nothing but a burden to the monastery because of his different education. Thus the conversation turns to the advantages and disadvantages of monastic life. Finally the Greeks depart accompanied by the farewells of our Cistercian.

No intelligent reader could peruse this work without an occasional broad smile at the clever self-criticism and self-disparagement. Not even a Cistercian could put the book down without admiration for the frequently witty handling of an extremely delicate question. If it was not actually written for the stage, the *Dialogue* has all the characteristic elements of a stage play. In a sense it is an *apologia* penned by a man, who after spending most of his life in the world, had obvious difficulties in adjusting himself to his monastic surroundings. Only one of many, and perhaps the most serious, of his problems was his loyalty to Gilbert of Poitiers or his tenacious adherence to his intellectual convictions. The Cistercians, it is obvious, were broadminded enough to accept "the once outstanding professor" despite certain eccentricities which his best intentions were insufficient to hide.

Everard who had grown old among his books appreciated their kindness. "How superior is a scholar's life to that of a monk where discipline and order control not only the hand but also the tongue and the mind", he exclaims toward the end of the *Dialogue*. That control of tongue and mind must have weighed heavily on a man like Everard who was apparently exempted from working in the fields. Being advanced in years, he felt confident the monks would take loving care of him in sickness and in death: "Compare", he says, "the goodness of monks to that of the scholars. A monk falls sick and one or even two men are appointed to look after him. They smooth his bed, wash his feet, prepare water for his hands and food for his table, they watch over him night and day if need be. With devotion and prayers they anoint him at the approach of death, bring him the Viaticum and carry the deceased into the church on their own shoulders. They bury him with dignified solemnity and follow his soul even beyond the grave with Psalms and Holy Masses. All that for the deceased."

---

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 282.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 283.

[21] *Ibid.*

"But when a scholar falls sick, who is at his side unless he is very rich? Only his servant or some woman devoted to his service closes his dying eyes. Two or perhaps three members of the clergy assist at his funeral. Who sings Psalms for him? *Vae soli.* But alas, all too often he dies a much more miserable death. This is what your state has to recommend itself. Behold this is what the life of scholars has to offer. And what shall I say about their final day? The rigour of discipline begins while you are still alive. Somebody fails in the monastery by breaking the silence, by giving signs he was not allowed to give, by doing something he was not supposed to do. He who sins publicly, must repent publicly. Compare their vigils with the somnolence of scholars, compare sobriety with drunkenness, fasting with feasting, coarse food and dress with worldly and scholarly pleasures, chastity with impurity, true learning with pseudo-knowledge, meekness with irritability, humility with human conceit—and then choose what you think ought to be chosen".[22]

The contrasts in the colours of this picture are too heavy, no doubt, and Everard was certainly the last to admit that the practice of monastic virtues in his days left nothing to be desired. At the same time we may rest assured that all scholars did not deserve so harsh a verdict, or experience so miserable a retribution, as our Cistercian would want us to believe.

V.

Before presenting the text of the two hitherto unpublished letters found in Everard's dossier, we may briefly recall the principal known facts of his life. He was born in the city of Ypres in Flanders, in the first quarter of the twelfth century. His education was mainly "Parisian" and comprised an excellent training in the liberal arts as a preparatory step to theology. In his school affiliation he was a follower of Gilbert of Poitiers, not only by attending his lectures wherever circumstances led Gilbert to move, but also by a loyal adherence to Gilbert's teaching when such allegiance occasioned severe conflict with those who, as he claimed, failed to grasp the fundamental soundness of Gilbert's position.[23] He studied canon law which presumably served him well in the entourage (1162-63) of Cardinal Hyacinth, later Pope Celestine III, during whose reign Everard wrote his *Dialogue*. As a canonist he was dependent on the works of John of Faenza, Rufinus and others. We have seen that he shows influences of the teaching of Stephen of Tournai and Sichard of Cremona. The *Summula* was not written before 1180. He entered the Cistercian Order at a later date and it seems that the letter to Pope Urban III (1185-87) was written before he joined the "white monks". Hence he probably became a religious of Clairvaux some time between 1185-91. The *Dialogue* is dated by its reference to Pope Celestine III (1191-98) and, in view of Everard's age, we may presume that he composed it during the earlier year's of Celestine's reign. The letter to Everard, whether authentic or

---

[22] *Dialogus*, p. 288.

[23] Everard seems influenced by Alan of Lille (Cf. *Dialogus*, p. 267) whose *Summa*, edited by P. Glorieux, *Arch. d'hist. doctr. et litt. du moyen âge*, XX (1953), 111-264, deserves special attention in this regard.

fictitious, was written later because it refers both to the letter of Urban and to the *Dialogue*.

The two letters, which are published here for the first time, are transcribed from Cambrai, Bibl. munic., *Ms* 259, fols. 228^{ra}-229^{vb} and 240^{vb}-241^{vb}. Like the *Dialogue*, they are not in the author's hand but are copies made during the early thirteenth century. The spelling adopted in the edition is modern; textual corrections are noted in the footnotes. There, too, will be found sufficient information concerning the author's sources. A number of marginal notes, added by the same scribe or another contemporary hand, are listed in the footnotes.

Epistola Everardi[1] de Quibusdam Articulis Fidei: de Homine Assumpto, de Duabus Naturis et Una Persona Christi, et de Proprietatibus Charactericis[2] ad Urbanum Papam III.

[1] *Domine, Dominus noster, quam admirabile est nomen tuum in universa terra:*[3] admirabile in potentia, in sapientia, in misericordia.[4] Admirabile in potentia ligandi et solvendi, admirabile in sapientia judicandi, admirabile in mericordia miserens subveniendis. Est itaque admirabile in throno regiae potestatis, admirabile in tribunali judiciariae discretionis. Est admirabile in cathedra catholicae eruditionis. *Domine, Dominus noster, quam admirabile est nomen tuum in universa terra.*

[2] Ideoque *a finibus terrae* ad te clamatur,[5] dum cor ecclesiae anxiatur. Clamatur autem ab his pro necessitatibus suis, ab illis pro injuriis sibi illatis, ab aliis pro honoribus adipiscendis. Et hi omnes quaerunt quae sua sunt, rari vero vel nulli quod Jesu Christi.[6] Omnes tractant de temporalibus, pauci vel nulli de spiritalibus. Ideoque coram te clamat et perstrepit *Lex Justiniana*, silet plerumque *Lex Domini immaculata.*[7] Et raro coram te fit controversia de fide christiana. *Tunica* tamen Domini *inconsutilis*[8] dissuitur, scinditur et, nisi a te, non est a quo consuatur. Fides Christi periclitatur, destruitur et non est, nisi a te, a quo construatur.

I.

[3] Sed, ut omittam haereses fere per universum mundum a laicis et inter laicos exortas, non possum silere errores quorundam in theologia studentium Parisius et alibi theologiam docentium sive discentium, quorum quidam pertinent ad Trinitatem, quidam ad Christi personam, quidam ad Christi naturam. Ad Trinitatem hoc modo: Inquiunt quidam, paternitas est Deus; alii, paternitas non est Deus.[9] At quantum periculum est affirmare Deum esse quod Deus non est, tantum periculum est negare Deum ipsum non esse quod ipse est. At isti affirmant de Deo quod illi negant. Igitur alteri, etsi non alterutri, errant. Errantes vero a te revocandi sunt.

Verum[10] si paternitas est Deus et filiatio et processio et innascibilitas, cum haec sint quattuor, sicut Trinitas est in unitate ita quaternitas in Trinitate. Item paternitate distinguitur Pater a Filio et ita paternitas est causa differendi et disjungendi Patrem a Filio. Eadem est communis essentia trium et ita quiddam commune eis et ita causa uniendi eis. Quae ergo causa Patri conveniendi cum Filio, ea est Patri causa differendi a Filio. Item si id, quo Pater est Pater, est substantia, Pater ad se et non ad aliquid dicitur.

[4] Quod Augustinus[11] negat his verbis dicens: *Quicquid Pater est quod Deus*

---

[1] Eurardi *Ms.* The reading of this name in the manuscript varies between Euerardus and Eurardus.

[2] karatericis *Ms.* In the *Dialogue* (p. 270) Everard speaks of characteristica nomina.

[3] *Ps.* viii, 2.

[4] in benignitate misericordia *Ms.*

[5] Cf. *Ps.* lx, 3: A finibus terrae ad te clamavi.

[6] Cf. *Phil.* ii, 21.

[7] *Ps.* xviii, 18.

[8] *John* xix, 23.

[9] *marg.* Quod relatio non est Deus.

[10] *marg.* oppositio.

[11] *marg.* Augustinus contra assertentes paternitatem esse Deum.

est, hoc Filius, hoc Spiritus sanctus est. Sed quod Pater est, non est illud quod Filius est. Pater enim non ad se sed ad Filium dicitur. Deus autem ad se dicitur. Eo ergo, quo Pater est Deus, est substantia. Et cum Filius sit ejusdem substantiae, proculdubio Filius est Deus. Sed quod Pater est, non est substantia. Non sic ergo Filium dicimus Patrem quemadmodum Filium dicimus Deum.[12] Audi,[13] pater, quod Augustinus dicit: Quod Pater est, non est illud quod Deus est; et quod Pater est, non est Deus. Hoc dicit de usia vel de hypostasi vel de notione. Sed de usia vel de hypostasi falsum est, quia et usia et hypostasis Deus et substantia est. Ergo intelligendum est de notione. Est ergo sensus: Quod Pater est, substantia non est, Deus non est, i.e., id quo Pater est Pater, substantia non est et Deus non est. Sed id est paternitas. Ergo paternitas substantia non est et Deus non est.

[5] *Deus*[14] *habet essentiam, habet sapientiam. Sed quod habet, hoc et est. Et omnia unus* <228va> *est. Ac perinde simplex est, quia non in eo aliquid accidentis est. Sed quod est et quod in ipso est, essentialiter est; excepto quod relative ad quamcumque personam est.*[15] Ex hac auctoritate concludi potest quod relatione qua Deus est Pater refertur ad personam. Igitur relatio Deus non est. Igitur vel paternitas non est relatio vel non est Deus.

Idem[16] dicit magnus Basilius: *Nobis ignorantibus circa singularia—characteres dico autem paternitatem, filiationem, sanctificationem—oportet communi proprium adjicere et fidem confiteri. Commune est deitas, proprium paternitas. Quibus copulatis, necesse est dicere: Credo in Deum Patrem.*[17] Igitur[18] cum paternitas sit proprium unius personae, deitas commune trium, nulla paternitas est essentia.[19]

[6] At cum sit eruditi hominis secundum Aristotelem[20] de his quae novit non mentiri et mentientem manifestare posse, oportet secundum Boethium[21] unumquodque prout ipsum est ita de eo fidem capere tentare.[22] Cum[23] vero tres sint species speculativae: *naturalis in motu inabstracta,*[24] nostra enim corpora in motu sunt sed a corpore formae abstrahi non possunt; *mathematica sine motu inabstracta,*[25] haec enim corporum formas speculatur sine materia ac per hoc sine motu; quae formae cum in materia sint, ab eis separari non possunt; *theologica sine motu abstracta atque separabilis. Nam Dei substantia et materia et motu caret,*[26] i.e., *nec*[27] *Deus nec ejus essentia potest esse materia. Neque enim ea, qua ipse est, essentia (quae graece dicitur usia) potest esse non simplex. Neque in eo eidem essentiae adesse aliquid aliud potest quo ipse sit. Non enim Deus simplex esset, si vel ejus essentia constaret ex multis essentiis vel eidem adessent formae in illo, quarum vel ipse Deus vere esset vel ejus essentia ratione diceretur subjecta materia.*

[7] Cum ergo, ut praemissum est, tres sint species speculativae: naturalis, mathematica, theologica, in naturalibus rationaliter,[28] *ut scilicet—posito nomine quo id quod est et id quo est significatur—philosophus ea vi mentis qua concreta reri debet diligenter attendat, quid proprie sibi vel id quo est vel id quod est*

---

[12] Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps. lxviii*, 3; sermo I, 5; PL 36, 844.

[13] *marg.* Determinatio.

[14] *marg.* Isidorus in VII lib. Etymologiarum.

[15] Isidore, *Etym.* VII, i, 27. Cf. *Dialogus*, p. 259.

[16] *marg.* Contra idem ait magnus Basilius.

[17] St. Basil, *Ep. CCXXXVI*, 6; PG 32, 883. Cf. *Dialogus*, p. 259.

[18] *marg.* Nota quae concurrunt ad esse personam secundum magnum Basilium De Trinitate.

[19] The wording of this conclusion agrees with *Dialogus*, p. 259.

[20] *Elench.* I, 2; PL 64, 1009B.

[21] *De Trinitate*, 2; ed. Peiper (Leipzig, 1871), p. 152.

[22] *marg.* Secundum Boethium in libro de Trinitate.

[23] Apart from some slight abbreviations the long passage: Cum vero . . . abstractorum proprietatibus judicare, occurs in *Dialogus*, pp. 255 f.

[24] Boethius, *De Trinitate*, 2; ed. Peiper, p. 152.

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] The passage: Nec Deus . . . diceretur subjecta materia, is taken from Gilbert's commentary on Boethius, *De Trinitate;* ed. N. M. Haring, *Studies and Texts* I (Toronto, 1955), 49.

[28] *supple:* versari oportebit. Cf. *Dialogus*, p. 256.

concretionis consortio exigat et quid ceterarum locis speculationum communicet. In mathematicis ubi inabstracta[29] *aliter quam sint,* i.e., *abstractim attenduntur, oportebit eum versari disciplinaliter ut, cum ea, quae nisi subsistentibus insint omnino nihil sunt, separatim ab eis conceperit, sic eorum propria ad disciplinam faciendam attendat, ut convenientes sibi cum ceteris speculationibus rationes ad ipsam minime contrahat.*[30] *In naturalibus enim dicitur homo species generis,* i.e., *animalis aut corporis. In mathematicis vero non generis sed individuorum tantum species dicitur*[31] *homo. Itaque naturalis concretionis proprietate dicitur genus de specie praedicari. Mathematicae vero abstractionis proprietate non genus sed generis genus de ea, quae non generis sed individuorum tantum species est, vere et proprie praedicari conceditur. In divinis vero quae non modo disciplina verum etiam re ipsa abstracta sunt, intellectualiter versari oportet,* i.e., *ex propriis theologorum rationibus illa concipere et non ex naturaliter concretorum aut disciplinaliter abstractorum proprietatibus judicare.*

[8] In[32] naturalibus ergo sunt decem praedicamenta, quae *si quis ad divinam verterit praedicationem cuncta mutantur.*[33] Itaque secundum Augustinum et Boethium ea quae sunt de praedicamento substantiae et quantitatis et qualitatis, relata ad divinam praedicationem, divinam quidem praedicant substantiam. Unde his terminis 'Deus, magnus, justus, fortis', idem de Deo dicitur; ut cum dicitur 'Deus est Deus, Deus est magnus, Deus est justus, Deus est fortis', divina essentia praedicatur.[34] Primorum igitur praedicamentorum praedicabilia[35] dicta de Deo sic praedicantur de eo, ut aliquid eum esse demonstrent. Cetera vero <228vb> septem praedicabilia praedicamentorum non sic praedicantur de Deo, *ut*[36] *eum aliquid esse demonstrent, sed ut aliquid ei extrinsecus quodammodo affigant.*[37] *Non ergo potest dici relativam praedicationem rei, de qua dicitur,* aliquid *addere vel minuere vel mutare. Non* enim *in eo quod est esse consistunt sed in eo quod est in comparatione aliquo modo ad aliud se habere.*[38] Cum ergo sint decem modi praedicandi in naturalibus, duo vero tantum in theologicis: unus ad se, alter ad aliquid, ille vero qui est ad se, pertinet ad substantiam, ille vero qui est ad aliquid, pertinet ad relationem. Cum autem relativis hoc ipsum sit esse *ad aliud* quodammodo *se habere,* manifestum est nullum relativum, i.e., nullam relationem esse divinam essentiam. Et ita paternitas non est divina essentia.[39] Et haec de primo errore dicta sufficiant.[40]

II.

[9] Consequenter igitur dicendum est de errore qui est de persona Christi et de eo qui est de Christi natura. Sed isti errores melius innotescent, si ad memoriam fuerint revocatae haereses Eutychiana et Nestoriana. Dixit itaque Nestorius duas naturas esse in Christo, et hoc catholice, et duas personas esse ejusdem, sed hoc haeretice. Sed Eutyches dixit unam personam solam esse Christi, et hoc

---

[29] abstracta *Ms.* The same reading (abtracta) is found in *Dialogus*, p. 256.

[30] *marg.* Verbum difficile intellectu.

[31] *supplevi*: dicitur . . . individuorum tantum species est. Cf. *Dialogus*, p. 256.

[32] *marg.* Divisio decem praedicamentorum. The text: In naturalibus . . . paternitas non est divina essentia, is found in *Dialogus*, p. 256.

[33] Boethius, *De Trinitate*, 4; ed. Peiper, p. 157. The *Dialogus*, p. 259, adds: Translatio enim fit vocabulorum a naturali facultate ad theologiam.

[34] *marg.* Tria prima praedicamenta dicta de Deo divinam praedicant essentiam, caetera non.

[35] The *Dialogus*, p. 259, reads praedicamenta instead of praedicabilia.

[36] Ut eum . . . ad aliud se habere, is taken from Gilbert's commentary; ed. Haring, p. 78.

[37] The *Dialogus*, p. 259, reads: Caetera vero septem praedicamentorum praedicamenta dicta de Deo, ut ait Boethius, sic praedicantur de eo, non ut eum aliquid esse demonstrent sed ut ei aliquid extrinsecus quodammodo affigant.

[38] *marg.* Sunt tantum duo modi praedicandi in theologia.

[39] The *Dialogus*, p. 259, reads: Manifestum est nihil, quod ad se praedicatur, praedicari ad aliud. Igitur nulla relatio est divina essentia. Et ita nec paternitas nec filiatio est divina essentia.

[40] *Rubrica et marg.* De secundo errore, scilicet de persona Christi.

catholice, secundum hoc unam solam naturam Christi, sed hoc haeretice. Fides autem catholica, quasi virtus in medio consistens, dicit duas naturas Christi cum Nestorio et contra Eutychem sed unam solam personam cum Eutyche et contra Nestorium.

Dixit itaque Nestorius duas essentias Christi et ideo duas naturas.[41] Inde conclusit duo subsistentia esse Christum, deceptus maxima naturalis facultatis qua dicitur secundum pluralitatem subsistentiarum specialium attendendam esse pluralitatem subsistentium.[42] Praedicando igitur duas subsistentias dixit: Christus *est* Deus et homo. Eodem modo subjiciendo duo subsistentia dixit: Deus et homo *sunt* Christus. Itaque dixit: Filius Dei et Filius Virginis *sunt* Christus et ita duae substantiae individuae *sunt* Christus: igitur, conclusit, duae personae, consequenter falsum ex falso inferens.

[10] Nostri vero Parisienses, audientes damnatam haeresim concedere[43] duas personas esse Christum, nomen pluralitatis rejiciunt sed significationem admittunt. Quod patet ex descriptione personae. Est enim *substantia individua rationalis naturae.*[44] Sed dicunt quod et una et alia substantia rationalis naturae sit Christus. Ergo et una et alia persona. Sed hoc negant.[45] Dicunt itaque Christum esse duas substantias quarum una Filius Dei, altera Filius Virginis. Et ita Filius Dei est pars cujusdam personae, quae Christus est, cujus est pars Filius Virginis. Dicunt igitur, quia Christus est Deus et homo, ideo duo, contra Athanasium[46] qui de Christo loquens in Symbolo ait: *Qui licet Deus sit et homo, non duo tamen sed unus est Christus.*[47]

[11] Sed sciendum est ad hoc, ut veri nominis binarius locum habeat, oportet ut sit collectio unitatum assistentium diversis proprietatibus similium effectuum et hoc diversorum subjectorum ut 'Petrus est homo, Paulus est homo; Petrus et Paulus sunt duo homines'. Eodem modo: 'Pater est una persona, Filius est una persona; ergo Pater et Filius sunt duae personae'.[48] Nota quod quandoque fit distributio subsistentium et subsistentiarum,[49] ut in proximo praecedenti exemplo. Quandoque fit distributio subsistentium et repetitio subsistentiae ut 'Socrates est rationale, anima Socratis est rationale; ergo Socrates et anima ejus sunt unum rationale'. Vel sic: 'Pater est Deus, Filius est Deus; ergo Pater et Filius sunt unus Deus', Deus deitate et unus unitate sibi addicta. Quandoque fit repetitio subsistentis et distributio subsistentiarum ut cum dicitur: 'Petrus est corpus, Petrus est rationale; igitur duo'. Non procedit. Eodem modo: 'Christus est homo, Christus est Deus; igitur Christus est duo'. Non sequitur. Nota per divisionem <229ra> dictum et compositionem concedi: 'Christus est Deus et homo'; sed tantum per divisionem dici: 'Christus est unus Deus, Christus est unus homo'. Falsum enim est per compositionem dictum: 'Christus est unus Deus et homo et ita substantia creata et substantia increata, non tamen duae substantiae'.[50]

[12] Contra praenominatos opponit Boethius[51] sic: Hoc nomen Christus aut convenit illis duabus substantiis aequivoce aut univoce. At si aequivoce convenit Filio Virginis et Filio Dei, alia ratione Filius Virginis, alia Filius Dei dicetur Christus. Et ita verum dixerunt Judaei objicientes Filio Virginis: *Quinquaginta annos nondum habes et Abraham vidisti?*[52] Et mentitus est Filius

---

[41] *marg.* Maxima naturalis facultatis Nestorius fuit deceptus.

[42] Gilbert deals with this principle in his commentary on *De Trinitate* (ed. Haring, p. 35) and claims that its erroneous application to the Trinity led to trinitarian heresies. We noted in the *Dialogue* (p. 276) that Everard tended to confuse trinitarian and christological issues.

[43] damnatam haeresim audientes concedere *Ms.*

[44] Cf. Boethius, *Contra Eutychen*, 3; ed. Peiper, p. 193.

[45] *marg.* Nota hic errorem de persona quod Filius Dei sit pars cujusdam personae.

[46] Anastasium *Ms.*

[47] Symbolum "Quicumque".

[48] *marg.* De distributione subsistentium et subsistentiarum.

[49] Cf. Gilbert's comment on *De Trinitate;* ed. Haring, pp. 62 f.

[50] *marg.* Quod nomen Christus aequivocum sit secundum quosdam.

[51] Cf. Boethius, *Contra Eutychen*, 3; ed. Peiper, p. 199.

[52] *John* viii, 57.

Virginis dicens: *Antequam Abraham fieret, ego sum.*[53] At si hoc nomen Christus convenit eis univoce, cum habeat plurale, convenienter dicetur: Filius Dei et Filius Virginis sunt duo Christi. Quod quidem dicere *praecipitatae mentis insania* est, ut ait Boethius.[54]

[13] Contra eosdem loquitur Augustinus in expositione hujus versiculi: *Israel, si audieris me, non erit in te Deus recens neque adorabis Deum alienum*: *Recens Deus est qui de novo incipit esse Deus.*[55] Sed secundum eos Filius Virginis incepit esse Deus de novo. Igitur est recens Deus. Item alienus est Deus qui non naturaliter est Deus. Sed Filius Virginis naturaliter est tantum homo. Igitur secundum eos, cui deitas non est substantialis, est alienus Deus. Isti igitur veri Israelitae non sunt nec vere Deum audiunt, qui recentem et alienum adorando Deum colunt. Cum igitur isti cum Nestorianis proculdubio conveniant in sensu, licet differant in verbis, semi-Nestoriani appellandi sunt.[56]

III.

[14] Procedendum est de errore qui est de Christi natura. Qui melius innotescet, si ad memoriam revocetur haeresis Eutychiana. Dicebat itaque Eutyches unam solam personam esse Christi et ita Christum esse unum solum subsistens. Inde concludit ejusdem unam solam substantiam esse sive essentiam et ita unam solam naturam,[57] recte utique et consequenter falsum ex falso inferens, deceptus quadam maxima naturalis facultatis qua dicitur secundum singularitatem subsistentis attendendam singularitatem subsistentiae specialis. Nullum enim subsistens est, quod non sit contentum una sola specie specialissima ut Petrus et hic leo. Itaque voluit extendere hanc maximam ad theologiam. Unamque solam Christi concludit essentiam, scilicet divinitatem, et ideo naturam.

[15] Cui concordant quidam Parisienses. Dicunt enim Christi unam solam essentiam, scilicet divinam. Inde debent concludere unam solam naturam. Sed, audientes damnatam esse haeresim negare duas esse naturas in Christo transumunt hoc nomen 'natura' ad significandum corpus et animam Christi, licet omnibus manifestum sit corpus et animam substantialiter differre et ita naturaliter. Ergo res sunt diversarum naturarum. Ergo non sunt una natura. Itaque isti nomen 'naturae humanae' Christo adaptant sed proprietatem nominis exsufflant contra Hilarium[58] dicentem: *Cui natura non inest, nomen naturae convenire non potest. Sed si nomen ingeritur, non proprietas sed nuncupatio dicetur.*[59] Ergo secundum hoc proprie non dicuntur duae naturae esse in Christo. Sed Eutyches, quia audierat duarum naturarum unionem factam in Christo, asseruit in Christo duas fuisse essentias, unam ante incarnationem, scilicet divinitatem, post vero humanitatem absorptam a divina natura. Itaque concessit Christum consistere ex duabus sed negavit in duabus consistere naturis.[60]

[16] Item in Genesi[61] legitur: *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem nostram et similitudinem nostram*: imaginem, quantum ad naturalia; similitudinem, quantum ad gratuita. Nam quis neget Christum caritatem et ceteras virtutes habuisse, cum legatur: *Unctus* <229rb> *oleo prae consortibus suis?*[62] Itaque si habuit virtutes, et ita gratuita, quis neget eum habere naturalia, scilicet rationalitatem et concupiscibilitatem? Et si rationalitatem creatam habuit, cum sit verus homo,

---

[53] *John* viii, 58.

[54] *Contra Eutychen*, 3; ed. Peiper, p. 199.

[55] Cf. *Enarr. in Ps. lxxx*, 10, 13; PL 37, 1039.

[56] *rubrica*: De tertio errore qui est de Christi natura.

[57] *marg.* Eutyches fuit deceptus maxima naturalis facultatis.

[58] Cf. Hilary, *De Trinitate* II, 4 f.; PL 10, 53 f.

[59] *marg.* Auctoritas Hilarii de natura: cui natura non inesse nec non convenire non potest. Perhaps it should read: cui natura non inesse, nec nomen convenire potest.

[60] Cf. Boethius, *Contra Eutychen*, 4; ed. Peiper, p. 203.

[61] *Gen.* i. 26.

[62] *Ps.* xliv. 8.

rationalitas adjuncta generi in eo fecit speciem. Et ita constat inesse Christo formam creatam substantialem, scilicet humanitatem. Nam et Eutyches concessit Christum Dominum resurrexisse et ascendisse in carne et anima. Et ita non discrepat ab istis, nisi quod melius senserit, quid verius esset natura Christi, quam isti.

[17] Contra quos loquitur Augustinus et Boethius et Papa Alexander. Augustinus[63] hoc modo: *Confitemur Dominum Jesum Christum ex tribus substantiis et duabus naturis, deitate et humanitate, consistere.* Ecce qualiter Augustinus distinxit inter substantias et naturas.[64] Boethius[65] quoque, ratione et cognitione philosophus et sana invisibilium fide theologus, in libro *De duabus naturis et una persona Christi* contra Eutychem loquens describit naturam hoc modo: *Natura est unamquamque rem informans specifica differentia.* Secundum quam Nestorius et catholici duas naturas posuerunt esse in Christo. Sed isti negant aliquam naturam, i.e., specificam differentiam veram esse in Christo.[66] Igitur isti catholici non sunt. Item Papa Alexander,[67] audiens abusiones quae procedebant ex hoc quod negabant hoc nomine 'homo' aliquid attribui Christo et quod Petrus et Christus non fuerunt vere duo homines nec Christus dicebatur eodem modo homo quo ceteri homines et quod in illo triduo ita fuerit homo sicut ante et post, praecepit ut diceretur Christus esse aliquid secundum quod homo. Auctoritati igitur Domini Papae cedentes dicunt: Christus est aliquid secundum quod homo. Sed perperam exponunt sic: Aliquid, i.e., alicujus modi.[68] *Et est novissimus error pejor priore.*[69] Cum igitur in sensu conveniant cum Eutychianis, licet differant in verbis, semi-Eutychiani dicendi sunt.

[18] Pater, hi sunt errores qui a Parisiensi civitate derivati fere per universum orbem seminantur. Hi sunt errores per quos pusilli et magni scandalizantur. Et cum quidam illorum panem sanae doctrinae esuriant, non evangelizantur. Nam etiam etsi aliqui sint, qui eis sanam doctrinam proponant, tamen quia aliter didicerunt eos audire nolunt. Nam perdere nolunt senes quod juvenes didicere. Et nemo est cui fidem de fide adhibeant nisi tibi. Ideoque *a finibus terrae* ad te clamandum judicant.

[19] Pater, hos errores in scholis existens audivisti et inter taliter errantes conversatus fuisti. Et licet tunc haberes scientiam et voluntatem emendandi, quia tamen non habebas auctoritatem, non correxisti. Sed cum nunc *nomen tuum admirabile* sit factum *in universa terra* et *magnificentia* tua sit *elevata super caelos,*[70] i.e., super sanctos et prudentes viros gloriam Dei enarrantes,[71] nunc a Domino sublimatus et ad fidei catholicae instructionem *conversus, confirma fratres tuos*[72] a finibus terrae ad te clamantes, in petra a te et per te exaltari desiderantes, in fide Christi confortari expectantes.

Pater, non haec propono coram hac reverenda Sede quia tot et tantos velim accusare de fide sed ideo quia nolo eos diuturnitate silentii suo errori praescribere vel quia volo a te corroborari in fide, ut vere possim uti verbis Prophetae dicentis: *A finibus terrae ad te clamavi, dum anxiaretur cor meum: in petra exaltasti me.*[73] Et in fide Christi corroborasti me.

[20] Haec est igitur petitio mea ut, omissis ad tempus quaestionibus temporalium, accedas et ascendas ad cor altum et intendas solutionibus harum quaestionum et qualibet septimana, dum vacare potes, coram te disputari facias de theologia, donec Parisiensibus scribens definias, utrum paternitas sit Deus, utrum relatio sit divina essentia, utrum aliquis homo incepit esse Deus, utrum duae sub-

---

[63] Cf. *Sent.* III, 6, 3; ed. Quaracchi (1916), p. 578.

[64] *marg.* Descripsit Boethius secundum quod Christo duae conveniunt naturae.

[65] *Contra Eutychen*, 1: ed. Peiper, p. 190.

[66] *marg.* Inconvenientia quae sequuntur quod negatur esse humanitas in Christo.

[67] Alexander III, *Ep.* "Cum Christus"; Mansi XXI, 1081.

[68] Peter of Poitiers, *Sent.* IV, 10; PL 211, 1172B.

[69] *Matth.* xxvii, 64.

[70] *Ps.* viii, 2 f.

[71] Cf. Lombard, *In Ps. viii*, 2; PL 191, 123D.

[72] *Luke* xxii, 32.

[73] *Ps.* lx, 3.

stantiae sint Christus, utrum una sola forma substantialis sit in Christo, licet hanc ultimam quaestionem aperte solvat Apostolus <229va> dicens de Christo: *Qui cum in forma Dei esset, non rapinam arbitratus est se esse aequalem Deo. Sed semetipsum exinanivit formam servi accipiens.*[74] Non rapinam Christus arbitratus est se esse aequalem Deo. Sed seipsum exinanivit formam servi accipiens. Erat ergo Christus in forma Dei Patris ab aeterno Patri consubstantialis singularitate essentiae. Sed factus consubstantialis matri, non singularitate essentiae, sed conformitate naturae.

[21] Hoc etiam dicit Ambrosius. In expositione finis hujus capituli super hunc locum: *Habitu inventus ut homo,* ait: *Tale est hoc quale est illud: Quasi Unigeniti a Patre.*[75] Acsi aperte diceret: *Ut* et *quasi* non fit ibi similitudinis sed expressivum veritatis.

Inde concludit Augustinus contra Nestorium et Eutychem: *Ex eo igitur apparet, quod ille ipse qui a solo Patre non factus sed natus est Deus, veritate formae Dei a Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto non natus sed factus est homo veritate humanae formae.*[76] Sicut ergo Christus habet formam substantialem divinam sic et humanam. Sed si forte quis velit referre ad exteriorem et non ad substantialem, respondeo: Si accidentalis forma ex toto in homine non esset, non minus tamen, dum viveret homo, homo esset. Itaque substantialia faciunt hominem, accidentalia probant.[77] Sed si Christus esset homo forma accidentali et non substantiali, non verus sed phantasticus homo esset. Quod absit.

[22] *Pater mi, Pater mi, currus Israel*[78] et supportator religionis christianae et *auriga ejus* et gubernator fidei catholicae, intende et attende, quanto labore, quanto studio et quanta diligentia antiqui Patres et sancti exstirpaverunt haereses Nestorianam et Eutychianam. Et cum tibi constiterit praenominatos theologos in damnatas haereses incidisse, sufficit hoc clero denuntiare et veritatem catholicae fidei proponere, scilicet unum tantum subsistens et unam tantum substantiam esse Christum et ita unam solam personam et duas subsistentias, i.e., duas essentias esse in Christo et ita duas naturas.

Et benignus Jesus, cujus interest fidem super se fundatam conservare, sicut tibi dedit scientiam et auctoritatem sic det tibi fidei suae veritatem investigare et investigatam confirmare. Amen.

Doctori Quondam Egregio Nunc Autem Dei Gratia Humili Christi Discipulo E(uerardo) Suo Fratri Carissimo Frater B.

[1] Ascendere *de virtute in virtutem*[1] cantica graduum modulando. Novissima illa tempora, quae praedixit Apostolus,[2] in nos arbitror devenisse. Et jam multis colligitur argumentis, e quibus illud attendo maximum quod aut ut minimum jam reputatur aut nullum, nam eo janua malis omnibus aperitur, quod *a veritate* quidem, inquit, *auditum avertunt, ad fabulas autem convertentur.*[3] Omitto homines saeculares. Nam hi *de mundo sunt.* Nec mirum si *de mundo loquuntur.*[4] Relinquo religiosos, ut videtur, ordinum diversorum: arbores scilicet autumnales, foliatas et steriles, solo nimirum a saecularibus habitu differentes secundum illud: *Et erit sicut populus sic sacerdos.*[5] His, inquam, omnibus derelictis, *leva oculos,*[6] quaeso, in ipsum montem Sion, ordinem ordinum loquor, ordinem nostrum. Flebis, ut aestimo, cum Jeremia, nisi nimium durus es, super *montem Sion quia disperiit. Vulpes ambulaverunt in eo.*[7]

---

[74] *Phil.* ii, 6.

[75] Lombard, *In Phil. ii,* 6; PL 192, 235B: Quod dicit "ut homo", tale est quale est illud "quasi unigeniti a Patre".

[76] Cf. Lombard, *In Phil. ii,* 6; PL 192, 233C.

[77] Cf. *Sent.* III, 11, 1; ed. Quaracchi (1916), p. 597.

[78] *IV Kings* ii, 12.

[1] *Ps.* lxxxiii, 8.

[2] *II Tim.* iii, 1.

[3] *II Tim.* iv. 4.

[4] *I John* iv, 5.

[5] *Is.* xxiv, 2. *Os.* iv, 9.

[6] *Is.* xlix, 18.

[7] *Jer. Lam.* v, 18.

[2] Jam plerique sanam doctrinam non sustinent, quibus nugae lectiones, rumores sermones sunt, de regibus illis non de legibus quaestiones. Loquuntur vana quia meditantur inania. *Ex abundantia enim cordis os loquitur.*[8] *Verbum enim Domini projecerunt,* sicut ait Propheta, *et sapientia nulla est in eis.*[9] *Si quis* est inter illos, qui *loquatur quasi sermones Dei,*[10] ille declinatur, ille abjicitur, ille oneri est, ille simplex et certe fatuus judicatur. Venit a foris quispiam rumigerulus.[11] Illi dicitur: "Tu sede hic bene". Illum honorifice fratres excipiunt. Ab illius ore dependent versa facie, intentis oculis, *arrectis auribus.*[12] Et illo jactante frivola, aperiunt ora sua quasi ad imbrem serotinum. Hic sapiens, hic facundus, hic denique gratiosus homo reputatur et bonus. Intentissime auscultat monachus. Et nunc quidem contrahitur in maerorem, nunc vero in cachinnum dissolvitur. Quin etiam irae, rixae, murmurationes, detractiones, animositates, contentiones, susurrationes, proh dolor, audiuntur in nobis. *Quomodo obscuratum est aurum, mutatus est color optimus.*[13]

Hiccine est praeceptum Christi? Haec regula Benedicti? Haec doctrina Bernardi? Heu, heu, *filii Sion inclyti et amicti auro primo. Quomodo* <241ra> *reputati sunt in vasa testea, opus manuum figuli?*[14]

[3] Verum haec jam superfluo fortasse carpere videar. Namque tu in *Dialogo*[15] tuo hujusmodi hominum monstra satis abundeque mordaci quadam elegantia pupugisti, locum istum suaviter plenissimeque pertractans. Quia vero sicut humilis expertum, inter nos quoque *veritas odium parit*[16] et juxta Salomon *os stultorum pascitur imperitia.*[17] His omissis, nos ad nostrum negotium accingamus. Et sicut ego in quaerendo, tu, Minerva vetus, tu vigiles in solvendo. De medio fiat omnis iniqua suspicio, facessat indignatio, rancor omnis absistat. Non tentator accedo sed motus meos gestio simpliciter. Aperi et fratri et amico. Ei vero qui noverit interpretari obscura et ligata dissolvere; immo vero qui haec gratanter etiam amplectatur et dari sibi occasionem gaudeat, ut addatur sibi sapientia. Dum me igitur in locum altum et gratum otium contulissem, studiis spiritualibus nacta opportunitate me tradidi, licet ad breve. Quod otium tum in legendo tum in scriptitando consumpsi, si tamen dici debet esse consumptum. Unum lucrum non minimum mihi gaudeo provenisse. Praetaxatum siquidem librum tuum grandi amore, multo studio, prout materiae dignitas postulabat, legi relegique non semel. Nam plus placebat lectio pluries repetita. In quo quaedam offendi, quae a te potissimum censui requirenda, dilucidanda, plenius et planius enodanda. Pauca sunt autem in quibus forte, ut adsolet, brevitas obscuritatem hanc peperit phantasiam.

[4] Cum ergo tibi super auctoritate Hieronymi,[18] quam objeceras, introductus a te Ratius responderet: *Bene,*[19] *inquit, opponis putans easdem esse proprietates nominum et personarum. Sed non est ita. Nominum proprietates sunt res eis significatae. Unde proprium est nominis*[20] *significare substantiam cum qualitate. Proprietates igitur nominum in Trinitate sunt significationes eorum, i.e., substantiae et qualitates. Substantiae personae sunt in Trinitate. Qualitates sunt relationes, quibus personae inter se referuntur ut paternitas Patris qua refertur ad Filium. Contra ergo Sabellii haeresim Hieronymus loquens ait: "Sabellii haeresim declinantes tres personas expressas sub proprietate distinguimus. Non enim nomina tantum sed nominum proprietates, i.e., personas confitemur". Asserebat enim Sabellius synonyma esse hujusmodi nomina Pater, Filius, Spiritus sanctus, ut mucro, ensis, gladius. Et ideo dicebat: quicquid Patri conveniebat,*

---

[8] *Matth.* xii, 34.

[9] *Jer.* viii, 9.

[10] *I Pet.* iv, 11.

[11] Cf. Jerome, *Epp.* *50,* 1 and *117,* 10.

[12] Ovid, *Met.* 15, 515.

[13] *Jer. Lam.* iv, 1.

[14] *Jer. Lam.* iv. 2,

[15] Cf. *Dialogus,* p. 246.

[16] Terence, *And.* I, 1, 41.

[17] *Prov.* xv, 14.

[18] *Dialogus,* p. 261: Hieronymus: Non solum nomina sed nominum proprietates i.e. personas confitemur.

[19] *Dialogus,* p. 261.

[20] *Dialogus,* p. 261: nominum.

et Filio et Spiritui sancto. Contra quam haeresim loquebatur Hieronymus negans synonymiam nominum quam Sabellius adstruebat. Et ita nominum proprietates diversas significationes vocat. Aliud enim significat hoc nomen 'Pater', aliud hoc nomen 'Filius', aliud 'Spiritus sanctus'. Quod non accidit in nominibus synonymis, quia quod mucro, hoc gladius, hoc[21] *ensis significat.*

[5] Totam hic posui Ratii rationem super auctoritate praemissa, ne te forte voluminis tui revolutio fatigaret et haberes prae oculis quae fueras quaesiturus. *Putans,* inquit, *easdem esse proprietates nominum et personarum.* Hic plane innuit Ratius alias esse nominum proprietates in Trinitate, alias personarum. *Nominum* itaque *proprietates* exequitur dicens illas esse *significationes eorum, scilicet substantias et qualitates. Substantias* utique, si bene intelligo, subsistentes vocans, quas Graeci dicunt hypostases, quae personas designant; *qualitates* vero relationes illarum. Cum igitur in ipso limite suae disputationis Ratius distinxisset inter proprietates nominum et personarum, proprietates quidem <241rb> nominum determinat in significationes eorum, in scilicet substantias et qualitates illorum. *Substantiae, inquit, personae sunt in Trinitate. Qualitates sunt relationes.* Igitur cum proprietates nominum in Trinitate sint significationes eorum, i.e., substantiae et qualitates, porro substantiae personae sunt, qualitates autem relationes illarum, profecto proprietates nominum sunt ipsae personae et relationes illarum.

[6] Hactenus, ut distinctum fuit, disputatum est de proprietatibus *nominum* in Trinitate. De proprietatibus vero *personarum* quod distinctionis ordo poscere videbatur, omnino tacitum est. Quo tandem consulto est supersessum? Non fuerat ergo praemittenda quae non fuit absolvenda distinctio inter proprietates nominum et personarum. An eaedem sunt? Sed hoc non vult illa distinctio. An aliae? Sed non apparent in sequenti disputatione. An personarum proprietates ipsae sint personae? Sed hoc videtur Ratius paulo superius improbare te reprehendens, qui intendebas probare quod proprietas personae sit persona. At vero si proprietas non est persona, quid est aut cui inest? Manifeste tamen in sequentibus dicit[22] quod *nulla est earum,* i.e., personarum *proprietas nec in essentia est unitas sed in uno. Et est, inquit, sensus: Tres personae proprietatibus distinctae, unum tamen in essentia.* Sed si nulla, inquam, est earum proprietas, cum solis proprietatibus suis distinguantur, nulla est earum distinctio. Distinguuntur autem proprietatibus suis. Aliquae igitur sunt earum proprietates.

[7] Dicam hic ego quod sentio: Melius est hic omnino silere quam temere quid proferre. Et hic libenter audio illud: *Altiora te ne quaesieris et fortiora te ne scrutatus fueris.*[23]

Item in sequentibus Ratius: *Si divinitas,* inquit, *est Deus, igitur vel Pater vel Filius vel Spiritus sanctus vel uterque duum vel quilibet trium. At si Pater est, ipsa generans est. Si Filius est, genita est. Igitur quae generat, gignitur. Quod Sabellianam haeresim sapit.*[24]

[8] Dico breviter quod sanius hoc adjunctive quam sub disjunctione dici videretur hoc modo: Si divinitas est Deus, ergo Pater *et* Filius *et* Spiritus sanctus. Nam hoc sequitur. Potest autem instari de divina substantia sic: Divina substantia est Deus. Igitur *vel* Pater *vel* Filius *vel* Spiritus sanctus. Non recte infertur. Sed ita: Igitur Pater *et* Filius *et* Spiritus sanctus. Deus enim est Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus. Non enim dicimus: Deus vel divina substantia est Pater vel Filius vel Spiritus sanctus sed Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus. *At si Pater est,* inquit, *ipsa generans est; si Filius, genita est.* Non quidem generat divina substantia, non divinitas, sed generat Pater qui est divina substantia, qui est divinitas, dicente Augustino: *Cum Pater est, non est illud quod est,*[25] quasi dicat: Patris est proprium generare, non substantiae, quae communis est tribus. Haud

---

[21] *Dialogus,* p. 261: idem.

[22] *Dialogus,* p. 262.

[23] *Eccli.* iii, 22.

[24] *Dialogus,* p. 264.

[25] Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps. lxviii,* 3; sermo I, 5; PL 36, 844.

secus de Filio genito et de Spiritu sancto procedente. Sed praemissa, inquis, verba Hilarii qualiter exponentur dicentis: *Deus non habet divinitatem.*[26] Cum ea ipse sit, non est divinitas? Satisfaciat ad hoc Ratius tuus, immo ratio tua.

[9] Verum sequens argumentatio non ita placet qua dicitur: *Si divinitas est Deus, etc.*[27] Sic de Deo et deitate, de quibus agitur non longe inferius. Item: *Sed cum hoc nomen 'Deus'*, inquit Ratius, *rem de qua est sermo significet pro substantia, i.e., pro persona, etc.*[28] Nulli dubium quod hoc nomen 'Deus', cum absolute ponitur, videlicet sine adjectione personae, quasi collectivum sit trium pariter personarum, sicut cum verbi gratia dicitur 'Deus Creator omnium' et hujusmodi nomina quae ad se dicuntur. Hic vero hoc nomen 'Deus' rem de qua est sermo significat pro substantia, i.e., <241va> pro usia, quae communis est tribus. At vero si sic exponitur ut dicatur *pro substantia, i.e., pro persona,* videtur assentiri Sabellio qui tres personas unam asseruit esse personam. Proinde hoc nomen 'Deus' rem de qua est sermo significat pro substantia, i.e., pro personis quae sunt una res, una substantia; non pro persona, propter Sabellium. At et hic translatio est a naturalibus ad theologica sic: pro substantia, i.e., persona, i.e., loco substantiae, i.e., personae, i.e., loco suppositi.

[10] Item miror quod visum fuerit Magistro G(illeberto), ut non concederet simplicem conversam hujus *'Trinitas est Deus' sicut nec hujus 'quilibet trium est homo'.*[29] Cum enim dicitur 'Deus est Trinitas', hoc nomen 'Deus' accipitur substantialiter, non personaliter, ut non concludi necesse sit, sicut ipse concludit: *Deus qui est Pater, est Filius;*[30] unde sequitur confusio personarum. Quin potius hoc luce clarius sequitur: Deus est Trinitas, ergo Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus. Est enim una substantia unus Deus: Deus unitas et Trinitas Deus.

[11] Item superius dixerat Ratius: *Verius*, inquiens, *immo veracissime secundum proprietatem dicendi sed non existendi 'Deus non est Deus, Deus non est justus, non est magnus' dicitur. Eodem modo 'Deus non est deitas, non est justitia, non est magnitudo' et ita 'Deus non est essentia'. Igitur multo minus 'sua essentia'.*[31] Longe porro inferius: *Habe igitur*, inquit, *ut praemissum est, cum dicitur 'Deus vere forma est quae ipsum esse est et ex qua esse est', causa dicendi assignatur, non proprietas essendi.*[32] Cum ergo superius dictum sit quod dicatur vere 'Deus non est Deus, non est justus', etc., et exposita sit causa dicti, videlicet quod negetur secundum proprietatem dicendi sed non negetur secundum proprietatem existendi, quid est, inquam, quod in sequentibus dicit: *Cum dicitur*, inquiens, *'Deus vere forma est', causa dicendi assignatur, non proprietas essendi*? Nam cum non negetur secundum proprietatem existendi 'Deus est Deus', proprie utique Deus est et existit Deus. Quapropter etsi dicatur improprie juxta Ratium tuum, proprie tamen est et existit Deus juxta eundem. Cum igitur proprietatem essendi vel existendi superius videatur adstruere et hic eandem destruere, videtur seipsum Ratius impugnare. Deus enim vere forma est, cum sit deitas, justitia, magnitudo secundum proprietatem existendi, etsi non dicendi.

[12] Item: *Caveant*, inquit Ratius, *sibi qui dicunt divinitatem esse totam Trinitatem et ita Spiritum sanctum, ne Macedonianae haeresis contrahant labem.*[33] Retulerat enim paulo superius legi in *Ecclesiastica Historia* quod Macedonius dicebat Spiritum sanctum esse divinitatem Patris et Filii et propterea negasse magistrum G(illebertum) *Deum esse divinitatem vel essentiam, ne in haeresim Macedonii incideret.*[34] Sed dum *fugit arma ferrea*, sicut ait Job, *incurrit in arcum aereum* et *qui timent pruinam irruet super eos nix.*[35] Itane divinitatem negabimus esse totam Trinitatem, videlicet ne confiteri cogamur Spiritum quoque sanctum simul esse divinitatem cum Patre et Filio, propter Macedonium scilicet asserentem Spiritum sanctum esse divinitatem Patris et

---

[26] *Dialogus*, p. 264.

[27] *Ibid.*

[28] *Dialogus*, p. 269.

[29] *Dialogus*, p. 270.

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] *Dialogus*, pp. 262 f.

[32] *Dialogus*, p. 280 (Ratius).

[33] *Dialogus*, p. 281.

[34] *Ibid.*

[35] *Job* xx, 24 and vi, 16.

Filii? Grandis absurditas: ipsis quoque Patri et Filio tollere divinitatem, ne cum eis participet et Spiritus sanctus, qui utique separari vel excludi non potest. Tantumne invidebimus Spiritui sancto, ut nec duobus reliquis concedamus divinitatem propter Spiritum sanctum? Vide ne forte sit minor blasphemia spoliare divinitate totam simul <241^{vb}> Trinitatem quam attribuere divinitatem uni soli personae juxta pestem Macedonianam.

[13] Item in *Epistola* tua *ad Urbanum Papam* ponis oppositionem Boethii contra illos qui dicunt Christum esse duas substantias, Deum et hominem, et ita duo. *Contra praenominatos,* inquis, *opponit Boethius sic: Hoc nomen 'Christus' aut convenit illis duabus substantiis aequivoce aut univoce. At si aequivoce convenit Filio Virginis et Filio Dei, alia ratione Filius Virginis, alia Filius Dei dicetur Christus.* Post haec interseris de proprio: *Et ita,* inquis, *verum dixerunt Judaei objicientes Filio Virginis: 'Quinquaginta annos nondum habes et Abraham vidisti'? Et mentitus est Filius Virginis dicens: 'Antequam Abraham fuit, ego sum'. At si hoc nomen 'Christus' convenit eis univoce, ait Boethius, cum habeat plurale, convenienter dicetur Filius Dei et Filius Virginis sunt duo Christi, quod quidem dicere praecipitatae mentis insania est.*[36]

Haec verba Boethii vellem lucidius atque plenius explanari propter quasdam auctoritates, quae videntur his refragari. Plane siquidem dicit Ambrosius: *Geminae gigas substantiae.*[37] Item Augustinus: *Confitemur Dominum Jesum Christum ex tribus substantiis et duabus naturis, deitate et humanitate, consistere.*[38] Et aliae aliorum plures.

[14] Quid tibi videtur, o mi frater E(uerarde)? Jam te rebaris quietum et in aurem accubare securum. Plerumque bonus dormitat Homerus.[39] Verum operi longo fas est surreppere somnium.[40] Importunus tibi fortasse videar aut molestus, qui dilectam inter amplexus sponsi suaviter quiescentem suscitare praesumo, antequam velit. Verum magis mea me urget esuries et amici ad me de via venientis inedia, quae me a te mendicare compellit tres panes,[41] trium scilicet facultatum quaestiones, quas proposuisti tractare Ratio comite. Expergiscere, rogo, advoca Ratium dispensatorem domus tuae. Excute horreum, aperi arcam, resera ostium, jube dari amico non modo tres sed et quotquot habet necessarios. Ad haec amicorum omnia esse communia vetus sententia est. Ergo de amicitia tua, immo vero de fraternitate praesumens tuli codicem tuum sive potius, ut regulariter loquar, codicem nostrum. Si feci quod non debui deferendo, en quod debeo facio satisfaciendo. Ecce habes quod tuum est, si tamen quicquam tuum est. *Non intres in judicium cum servo tuo.*[42] EXPLICIT EPISTOLA FRATRIS B. AD FRATREM EUER(ARDUM) DE DUBITATIONIBUS IN SUPERIUS TRACTATO DIALOGO HABITIS.

---

[36] *Ep. ad Urbanum,* 12.

[37] Augustine, *Contra serm. Arian.,* 8, 6; PL 42, 689. It is also attributed to St. Ambrose by Humbert, *Adv. Sim.* II, 44; MGH *Lib. de lite* 1, 193.

[38] Cf. *De Trinitate* XIII, 17, 22; PL 42, 1031.

[39] Cf. Horace, *Ars poetica,* 359.

[40] *Ibid.,* 360. Cf. William of Conches, *De Phil. mundi;* PL 172, 43B.

[41] Cf. *Luke* xi, 5.

[42] *Ps.* cxlii, 2.

Chaucer's Retraction and Mediaeval Canons of Seemliness

WILLIAM A. MADDEN

CHAUCER'S apologetic attitude in several widely discussed passages which appear in his two major works has been, and no doubt will continue to be, a source of dispute. It has provoked reactions in our own time ranging from downright incredulity to frank regret.[1] The most generally accepted explanation, however, seems to be the one defended by Professors Root and Tatlock, both of whom rely on Chaucer's sources. Professor Root deals principally with the possible influence of the *Decameron* on Chaucer's apology for the Miller's Tale.[2] Professor Tatlock has tried to establish the existence of an "apologetic tradition" as the source of the more sweeping "retractions" at the end of *Troilus and Criseyde* and the *Canterbury Tales.*[3] Implicitly, I think, these arguments question both Chaucer's sincerity and his originality. The connection between the passages in question and their presumed sources seems to me a very tenuous one, and one wonders if it would not be helpful to try to discover first whether Chaucer had anything to apologize for and then to try to determine the nature and extent of his aberrations as they would be judged from the fourteenth-century point of view.

To achieve this end we must try, I think, to understand the position of Chaucer's age and audience regarding what sociologists term "seemliness." This is important because the concept of what is seemly or unseemly determines the attitudes of a society toward social conduct. It differs in unequal degrees, depending upon the society in question, from concepts of what is moral or legal. This concept of seemliness, therefore, will enable us to distinguish the kinds of "sins" of which Chaucer may have been guilty, to determine how these "sins" might differ from those with which a modern author would be charged, and to see whether or not they explain Chaucer's apologies. Without taking up in detail the definitions of social historians, we can observe merely that what is "seemly" in any society may vary among the groups within that society, and that for any given group, as for society in general, seemly behavior may or may not coincide with morally or legally permissible behavior. The latter distinctions, if we follow H. M. Kallen, are to be made on the basis of the coercive social agency which punishes the transgression; "illegal" conduct falls under the jurisdiction of the political power, "immoral" conduct under ecclesiastical authority, and "unseemly" conduct under the sanctions exercised by society itself. I would like to emphasize the fact that sometimes—the frequency varying with the different outlooks of different societies—what is "right" or "wrong" for one authority will coincide with the standards of right and wrong held by the other two authorities.[4]

This last point is important, since it helps us to appreciate one of the major differences between fourteenth-century and twentieth-century canons of seemliness. Let me illustrate. When King Henry II assassinated the Archbishop Thomas a Becket in 1170, there was, as M. Jusserand has shown,[5] a reaction throughout

---

[1] For a summary of opinions see Eleanor Prescott Hammond, *Chaucer: A Bibliographical Manual* (New York, 1908), pp. 321-22.

[2] R. K. Root, "Chaucer and the *Decameron*", *Englische Studien*, LXIV (1912), 1-7.

[3] J. S. P. Tatlock, "Chaucer's Retractions", *PMLA*, XXVIII (1913), 521-29.

[4] H. M. Kallen, "Morals", *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences* X (New York, 1935).

[5] J. J. Jusserand, *English Wayfaring Life in the Middle Ages (XIVth Century)*, tr. Lucy Toulmin Smith (3rd ed., London, 1920), p. 248.

Europe which can only be described as one of horror. Why? Because for the European of that time it was obvious that spiritual as well as social and legal laws had been transgressed; significantly, indeed, it was the spiritual implications of the crime which overshadowed all other considerations. The horror of the act lay in its kinship to blasphemy. A parallel modern situation on the other hand, I am thinking of the trial and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty, provoked a quite different reaction among modern Europeans and Americans. Whatever the spiritual or social consequences of this act, what the modern mind sensed above all was the political injustice at work.[6] The epithet which most adequately describes and stigmatizes the crime for us would be "undemocratic." There are also interesting differences between modern and mediaeval sensitivity to the physical pain accompanying these crimes, but perhaps enough has been said to suggest certain important differences between mediaeval and modern sensibilities in general.

Now, if we may again consult the sociologists, these differences in response can be accounted for by ideological and biological pressures which shaped mediaeval and modern tastes respectively.[7] To take the ideological factor first, certainly the outstanding difference between Chaucer's age and our own is that which has resulted from the ever deepening discriminations between the various law-enforcement agencies—state, church, and society. In the fourteenth century not only were the three instrumentalities much more closely interfused than now, but the ecclesiastical power, though in the decline, still held the supremacy which later was to pass to the state and now seems to be enjoyed by society itself. In the fourteenth century an archbishop was as apt to prosecute the laws of the realm as to define theological dogma, and this was because theology very often was the source of political laws. Heresy and treason, for example, would call down identical punishments. In social matters, too, the pulpit literature which has survived is evidence of how tirelessly the ecclesiastical authority legislated on habits of dress, commerce, dancing, eating and drinking, social relations and the conduct of work and play in general. The habit of thought created by this situation made it inevitable that mediaeval Europeans should, by modern standards, confuse the political, social, and religious implications of Becket's murder. On the other hand, to them the reaction of modern Europeans to the Mindszenty experience would appear as a curious instance of hair-splitting and worse. Ideologically, therefore, despite the growing challenge to ecclesiastical authority, by the state in political matters and by the influence of courtly love ideas concerning social relations, the Church in Chaucer's time was still the ultimate arbiter of right and wrong.

Biological pressures, of course, were a countervailing force to ideological pressures. The Church had from the beginning tried to spiritualize, as it were, the biological crises in human life—birth, nutrition, puberty, marriage, and death—by its sacramental system and liturgical ceremonies. Thomas Aquinas stated beautifully and succinctly the ideal of the sacramental approach to the physical universe.[8] But then, as always, physical circumstances went far toward compromising this ideal. The enduring problems of disease, inadequate food, close living quarters, exposure to climatic vagaries, and so forth could not but color mediaeval attitudes toward the physical and biological world. The omnipresence of pain and proximity of death had its effect, for example, on the mediaeval attitude toward methods of punishment and even, as we shall see, habits of language.[9] The overall result of the physical environment's effect on mediaeval physiological and psychological processes is continually forced on our attention in the literature which the age produced. The historical incident in which King John permitted his enemy's wife and son to starve slowly to death[10] finds its literary equivalent in the Ugolino episode in the *Divine Comedy,* translated later by Chaucer. Or think again of the rigors of a Constance or a Griselde. The relative absence of sentimentality, unabashed emotional displays, violent vindictiveness in avengers, blunt language in *fabliaux* and sermons, exaggerated courtly-love effects, violent and grotesque religious manifestations, abrupt swings from one emotional extreme to the other (think of the incident between the Pardoner and the Host)[11]—all these phenomena suggest that mediaeval man required grosser, or at any rate different stimuli to stir his emotions than we do. They also suggest how physical conditioning made attainment of the sacramental vision difficult in practice.

---

[6] For example, in his introduction to the authorized White Book by Cardinal Mindszenty, Akos Zombory takes considerable pains to establish the special relation of church, state, and the society prevailing in Hungary and to exonerate the Cardinal from charges of having wielded the sword, upon which the Communist Government had based its case (*Cardinal Mindszenty Speaks*, Authorized White Book [New York, 1949], with introduction by Akos Zombory, pp. 1-27).

[7] W. G. Sumner, *Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Customs, Mores, and Morals* (Boston, 1913), pp. 463-66.

[8] See *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 60, a. 3.

On the whole, therefore, we might conclude that fourteenth-century social responses tended to be more uniform and more uniformally ethical, in the strict sense, than ours by virtue of the prestige and power of a common religious authority, and to be more direct and violent than ours because of physical conditioning.

When we turn to the *Canterbury Tales* and to specific areas of conduct we find that these generalizations require some qualification, but also that they help to explain a good deal of what at first sight is unintelligible to the uninstructed modern reader. We will find that the behavior of the pilgrims represents a kind of compromise between the ideal and the actual such as our generalizations would lead us to expect, that then as now social custom played an extremely important part in stabilizing society in the face of sometimes violently antagonistic pressures. Habits of dress, to select one example, are a result of complex pressures: physical necessity for warmth, social desires for status, moral ideals of decency, and even aesthetic instincts. It is not necessary, I think, to investigate all the details of the manner in which notions of seemliness affected the pilgrims in almost every department of behavior. I will sketch merely how seemliness operates in certain peripheral areas, and then dwell at greater length on the crucial social matrix of marriage, around which so many social customs, desires and ideals cluster.

To begin first with the nature of the pilgrimage itself, we must recognize that for the pilgrims the occasion was social as well as religious. The similarities between a mediaeval pilgrimage and a modern travel tour have been pointed out by others.[12] Incessant and universal, they were nonetheless frequently denounced.[13] We must expect, as a mediaeval reader would, that the *Canterbury Tales* will treat the idle, the vagrant, the opportunistic, and the pleasure-seeker as well as the devout. From the opening thirty-four lines down until the very end, Chaucer makes it clear that the pilgrimage was governed by the psychology of which the Host was presiding genius. For most of the upper class and all the lower class pilgrims it was an unusual experience, challenging as any movement outside one's accustomed orbit is apt to be, at one and the same time a vacation, a sight-seeing tour, and a religious act. Hence one may detect that curious mixture of reverential awe, excitement, and irresponsibility which one finds among a group of pilgrims today at a modern shrine, at the Empire State Building, let us say, or the Grand Canyon. Many normal restrictions or urges were temporarily suspended, and only the most elemental desires and antagonisms of the routine world were likely to carry over into the special Zeitgeist of the pilgrimage. When they do, even the Knight will appeal to the spirit of the moment in order to restore peace. In fact, the pilgrimage which Chaucer describes for us appears to be unusually "myrie," since both the experienced Host and the Canon's Yeoman comment upon it.[14]

---

[9] Cp. L. F. Salzman, *Mediaeval Byways* (London, 1913), Chapter IV, for mediaeval medical practices; F. A. Gasquet, *The Great Pestilence* (London, 1893), for the havoc wrought by a series of plagues between 1348 and 1376.

[10] See H. W. C. Davis, *England under the Normans and Angevins, 1066-1272* (5th ed., London, 1918), p. 363.

[11] See Roger Vercel, *Bertrand of Brittany: A Biography of Messire de Guesclin,* tr. Marion Saunders (London, 1934), p. 64, on the vindictiveness of the Black Prince and the effect of this behavior on the social status of knighthood; G. R. Owst, *Literature and Pulpit in Mediaeval England* (Cambridge, 1933), for samples of pulpit oratory; and J. L. Lowes, "The Loveres Maladye of Heroes", *MP,* XI (1914), 491-546, on the effects of courtly-love.

[12] See Jusserand, *op. cit.,* p. 357 ff. and H. D. Traill and J. S. Mann, edd. *Social England* II (New York, 1902), p. 375.

[13] See Jusserand, *op. cit.,* pp. 357-61, where relevant passages from Langland, Wycliffe, and Erasmus are cited.

It is only within the context of this special atmosphere of a pilgrimage that the pilgrims' conduct can be understood. The standards regulating drink, for example, are based on an attitude of full acceptance, loosely limited by a notion of moderation. The temperate man may, as one pilgrim says, hold to the mean,[15] but when the Manciple censures the Miller's drunkenness, the Host brings about a reconciliation with his hymn to "Bacus."[16] It is only after the Miller's condition threatens social order that the Host himself severely censures him.[17] Similarly, it is surely not devotion but regard for the social consequences which inspires the "gentils" to take exception to the Pardoner's proposal that they all stop for a drink.[18] One suspects that private excess was matter for the individual conscience, that public excess went uncensured so long as it did not interefere with the social commitments of others, and that the tacit rules governing a pilgrimage were, despite ecclesiastical law, especially lenient. In brief, habits and attitudes were determined by social standards of the "seemly" rather than by ecclesiastical authority.

The same may be said, I believe, regarding habits of dress and adornment. The pilgrims conform to social rather than to moral standards, to what was "seemly" rather than to what was permitted by the church. The excessive elegance of the Prioress' and the Monk's garb, slyly hinted at by Chaucer the poet,[19] arouses no disapproving comment from the other pilgrims. The occasion warranted, so far as social standards were concerned, an element of display in one's costume. Only the Canon's dress provokes comment, because he had not had time (or, as the Host suggests, the money) to equip himself as befitted his rank.[20] Although Chaucer comments on his pilgrims with great effect by describing their dress, there are no violations of seemliness involved so far as the pilgrims themselves are concerned. Chaucer, it may be suggested, was more observant and sensitive in these matters than the other pilgrims.

About the relationship of upper to lower classes, of men and women, of laity to religious, and of the various professions to one another, it is not so easy to be certain. Chaucer's field is rather limited, as we know from a comparison of the *Canterbury Tales* with *Piers Plowman*, and it is also incomplete in itself.[21] We can see, however, that the relation between the sexes is both more deferential and more liberal[22] than we might expect from the position of women described in pulpit literature. More important is the fact that the relation of lay to religious follows the social hierarchical pattern rather than a separate standard. Finally, it is evident that professional antagonisms are strong enough to sweep aside accepted social customs. Of the three outright breaches of seemliness in the

---

[14] F. N. Robinson, ed. *The Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston, 1933), A, 763-65 and G, 581-92. Where references are made to Chaucer's text they will refer to this edition, and cite the fragment letter and line numbers, as above, rather than the page.

[15] *Works*, I, 832.

[16] *Works*, H, 99 ff.

[17] *Works*, A, 3134-35.

[18] *Works*, C, 320-26.

[19] *Works*, A, 151-62 and 190-97.

[20] *Works*, G, 627-37.

[21] See John M. Manly, *Some New Light on Chaucer* (New York, 1926), Chapter 2.

[22] See, for example, *Works*, B, 1635-42 and D, 829-56.

Canterbury Tales, those involving the Miller, Reeve and Manciple[23] and the Friar and Summoner[24] have their roots in professional hostility, the incident between the Host and the Pardoner being the other instance. In the relation of lay to religious, we find the Host more deferential to the Monk and the Friar than to the Summoner and the Pardoner. And, in general, we find the pilgrims in a mood to reveal themselves, and not even the Pardoner's exposure of his own viciousness seems to provoke any social disapproval. The Host's unusually violent reaction to the Pardoner's proffer of his pseudo-relics, though intensely dramatic, seems to be a matter of clashing personalities rather than of social mores, though no doubt the Pardoner inspired moral revulsion in the more devout pilgrims.[25]

Standards of language were, with exceptions we will mention in a moment, similarly liberal. Swearing, even for a Prioress, seems to have been common practice, perhaps even a method of displaying one's erudition or refinement or originality.[26] Reading the *Canterbury Tales* is itself sufficient to render the numerous oaths as innocuous to us as they were to the pilgrims. Yet we should not forget that swearing in all but a few situations was theoretically condemned, as the Parson does not fail to call to the pilgrims' attention.

To take just one more example, we may remark that standards of entertainment tended also to follow social lines of demarcation. Hence, though entertainment value was the basic criterion for a good story, the "gentils" wanted something instructive embellished with rhetorical skill, while the "cherles" wanted something they could accept as historically true, expressed in familiar language and preferably dealing with their own kind of experience. The pilgrims who come between the two major groups—the Merchant or the Manciple, say—seem to maintain a correspondingly ambiguous aesthetic, honoring with their lips what the upper classes enjoyed, but enjoying in their hearts what the lower orders relished, retaining it would seem the standards of that level of society from which they presumably emerged.[27] In any event both pious and scatological tales alike must be interpreted as appealing to mixed and not always compatible interests in the hearers. To the "gentils" the Prioress' Tale was an edifying saint's life well told; for the "cherles" it was a tale of the marvelous and remote which happened to be true. To both classes it had the pathetic appeal attaching in the mediaeval mind to childhood innocence and suffering. The religious pilgrims do give evidence in the stories they tell or refuse to tell of adhering to canons of seemliness more consonant with the moral ideals of the age. The Monk refuses to speak of hunting and the Parson to tell a "fable," and the actual tales of the other religious pilgrims are for the most part essentially didactic and edifying. This does not enable us to conclude, of course, that they were the moral superiors of the laity, but only that in this matter the seemly and the moral for once coincided. Even here, however, we find exceptions in the tales of certain lower class clerics, whose conduct follows the standards of their social rank rather than of their spiritual office.[28]

In summary, we should note that in each area of conduct examined we have found a discrepancy between the ideal conduct recommended by the ecclesiastical authority and the actual conduct acceptable as seemly, in the whole spirit and conduct of the pilgrimage, in dress, in social relations between groups, in language, and in the nature of stories told and enjoyed.

But by far the most interesting, crucial, and revealing theme of the *Canterbury Tales*, so far as seemliness and Chaucer's retractions are concerned, centers around the concept of marriage. As one social historian has said, marriage is "the consecration of the biological functions, by which the instinctive activities of sex and parenthood are socialised and a new synthesis of cultural and natural elements is created in the shape of the family."[29] Here, therefore, the two pressures which shape societal attitudes—the ideological and the biological—find themselves in immediate contact, and the resolution which emerges out of their confrontation goes far toward determining standards of seemliness. In fourteenth-century England, marriage, like everything else, was given its ideological definition by the Church, the conjugal assent of the two spouses making their union an image, as St. Paul had said, of the union of Christ and his Church. The dogmatic and liturgical expression of this sacramental view was somewhat clouded by the celibate ideal, to be sure, but ideally celibacy possessed its nobility precisely in proportion to the nobility of the thing it sacrificed.

---

[23] *Works*, H, 25-45.

[24] *Works*, D, 1286-89.

[25] For the whole incident, see *Works*, C, 919-68.

[26] On oaths in general and the Prioress' 'St. Loy" in particular, see Manly, *op. cit.*, pp. 214-15.

[27] See *Works*, A, 3909-11 and H, 203-22.

[28] Unfortunately Chaucer did not give us the reaction of the other pilgrims to the tales of the Friar, Pardoner, or Summoner.

The real challenge to this ecclesiastical ideal was not the celibate ideal but the equally dogmatic and essentially secular view of marriage represented by the "courtly-love" tradition. Though it arose among and was limited to the lay aristocracy, the theory of courtly love represented a real ideological challenge to the power of the Church. Here, if anywhere, the orthodoxy of the literary man was put to the test, for courtly-love remained in theory and practice outside of and subject to the standards of marriage formulated by the Church.[30]

On the biological side, of course, the ideal of marriage, whether ecclesiastical or courtly, was much tempered by economic and other factors. Probably the chief difference between the biological pressures in mediaeval and modern times was the familiarity in Chaucer's day with the crudities of daily life. The intimacy enforced by physical environment made plain to all the mediaeval world what moral and material refinements have made distant, not to say unmentionable, in our own day.[31] Even in sermons the sex act, genital and execremental organs and processes, physical blemishes, and so forth were discussed quite bluntly in public.

Out of the clash of these opposed pressures in the general area of marital relations, then, there emerged, in literature and life, two resolutions. In literature the subject was either treated in a frankly farcical, comical, or pornographic way, or it was treated ideally, either from the ecclesiastical or the courtly-love point of view. In life, marriage was generally either a pre-arranged or accidentally necessary matter for adolescents or at best a practical arrangement in which theory gave way before the needs and urges of ambitious families. The bourgeois marriage, later so common, which tried to reconcile social ambitions with marriage ideals was just beginning to find literary expression in books like *Le ménagier de Paris*.[32] On the whole, the position of women was less servile and bleak than the enormous mass of "monkish" literature would suggest. Miss Power, in her careful analysis of the available evidence, concluded that "in daily life the position occupied by women was one neither of inferiority nor of superiority, but of a certain rough and ready equality."[33]

There is much evidence in the *Canterbury Tales* to confirm Miss Power's conclusion, and to indicate that the mediaeval ideals of marriage, sacred and secular, were greatly tempered, if not openly defied, in individual cases. Nothing could be more remote from the courtly-love ideal than the various marriages of the Wife of Bath, just as nothing could be more remote from the sacramental ideal than the experience of the Merchant. The self-revelations of the Host and the Merchant and the Wife of Bath are in fact descriptions of the responses to accepted ideals of certain individuals, descriptions which make only too clear how remote the ideals were from reality. Only the Franklin, "Epicurus owene sone," manages a happy resolution and that turns out to be based on a Stoic outlook.

---

[29] Christopher Dawson, *Enquiries into Religion and Culture* (London and New York, 1933), p. 271.

[30] C. S. Lewis, *The Allegory of Love: A Study of Mediaeval Tradition* (London, 1936), pp. 40-42, defines the basic incompatibility of courtly and Christian concepts of love.

[31] See *Works*, G, 663-67; D, 118-34; A, 385-86; I, 857.

[32] Eileen Power's *The Goodman of Paris* (London, 1928), contains a not quite complete English translation.

[33] Eileen Power, "The Position of Women", *Legacy of the Middle Ages*, edd. G. C. Crump and E. F. Jacob (Oxford, 1926), p. 410.

The two features of Chaucer's treatment of marriage and of the attitudes of his pilgrims toward marriage which are most alien to the modern mind are, first, the assumption behind every discussion that marriage is indissoluble and, second, the manner in which the pilgrims express themselves in sexual matters. The first feature is a result of ideological pressure, the second, as I have tried to indicate, of biological pressure. The first feature we are ready to accept as a historical accident, even though the courtly-love ideas are more congenial; the second bias led one critic, at least, to conclude that "it would appear that no conceivable grossness was unacceptable if it was witty."[34] Evidence in the *Canterbury Tales* indicates this judgment to be an exaggeration, since even the Wife of Bath would set limits to the treatment of sex in literature.[35] More to the point, as we shall shortly see, Chaucer himself had misgivings as to where to draw the line in this matter.

On the whole, the *Canterbury Tales* suggest, as we might now expect, that distinctions must be made between groups with respect to seemliness in sexual relations and language. In general, pilgrims from the lower classes indulged in the farcical, realistic, comical, or pornographic attitude, as in the case of the Shipman, the Host, the Wife of Bath, the Miller, the Reeve, and the Cook. On the other hand, the "gentils" adhered to the ideal in their tales, as we see in the narratives of the Knight, the Squire, the Physician, the Man of Law, and Chaucer. The religious are, on the whole, silent on the subject of marriage, with the notable exceptions of the Clerk and the Parson. Thus the element of seemliness would arise only should a member of the upper class adopt in public the behavior or language of the lower class. If, for example, the Knight should tell the Miller's Tale or adopt the Wife of Bath's conversational tone. The "gentils" do not object to the Reeve's Tale, or to the Host's hearty approval of the Cook's plan to tell "a litel jape that fil in oure citee." Again, it is those who are ambiguously situated socially who reveal the greatest uneasiness in treating sex. The Reeve, the Merchant, and the Manciple all felt obliged to apologize for their language. Both the Merchant and the Manciple address their apologies to the "gentils," whereas the Host, by contrast, in his characteristic response to the Shipman's Tale, appeals directly to his "felawes," that is, if we follow Robinson's gloss of the term, to the "cherles" as though they were naturally the most interested party in such goings on. The apologies of the "gentils" are all of a strictly literary nature, the Squire's inability to describe beauty, the Knight's inability to "ryme," the Monk's failure to follow chronological order, Chaucer's divergences from his original, and so on.

Thus, in the all important area of conduct having to do with marriage, we find that there is again a distinct gap between what is "seemly" and what is morally acceptable. Neither the Knight's tale nor the Squire's, so far as we have it, is in harmony with the religious ideas on marriage then ideologically dominant, although they are less alien to those ideas than certain of Chaucer's earlier works. Again, although indecent language was unseemly in the mouths of "gentils," secular or religious, private aberrations, if we may believe the "cherles," was something else. The "gentils" furthermore do not object at any time to the gross stories told by members of the lower orders of society, though they themselves are impeccably "nice" in their own narratives. The pilgrims in the middle social rank show some awareness of the distinction in seemly conduct that separated high from low society. And though there are limitations even to what the lower classes feel justified in describing, their language is frequently and uncomfortably blunt for modern tastes. That canons of seemliness really differed from moral standards is evident again in the fact that the tales and conduct of the religious tend to follow tastes based on social rather than moral distinctions, the Friar, Summoner, and Pardoner indulging themselves in a way that would be clearly unacceptable in a Monk or Prioress, though the former were as morally bound by laws of chastity and decency as the latter.

---

[34] F. Warre Cornish, *Chivalry* (London, 1901), p. 301.

[35] *Works*, D, 733-36. See also *Works*, E, 1962-64.

Now, so far as Chaucer himself is concerned, it is useful to distinguish the three aspects of his personality as we have them in the *Canterbury Tales*. First, there is the picture which he gives of himself, as one of the pilgrims. Secondly, there is the more tenuous and ghostly image of the poet reading his work to his court audience and friends, ambiguously hinted at in the Sir Thopas Tale. Finally, there is Chaucer of the apologies and, above all, of the Retraction.

First, as to Chaucer the citizen and pilgrim, there is conflicting evidence. The shy, elvish, portly figure of the Sir Thopas prologue does not quite harmonize with the congenial figure hinted at in the General Prologue. But in neither case, and nowhere in the *Canterbury Tales*, do we find Chaucer even remotely connected with unseemliness personally, in language, dress, or behavior. There is, however, a real ambiguity in the tales he assigns himself which is important, I think, to the right understanding of his position. It is difficult to decide with any certainty whether Chaucer's selection of his own tales was governed by dramatic requirements or by consideration of his audience. There is internal as well as external evidence indicating that parts at least of the *Canterbury Tales* were composed for oral recitation.[36] If Chaucer himself was the reader, how to present a picture of himself as a pilgrim to his audience must have been an extremely delicate task. I do not think there can be much doubt that Chaucer meant the Sir Thopas narrative, and the Host's reaction to it, as ironic comments on his own skill and on the Host's literary standards. In any event, the Chaucer of Sir Thopas could not but remind his audience of Chaucer the romance-reader who also had written many things in the courtly-love tradition. By contrast, the Chaucer who reacts as he does to the Host's criticism and proceeds to narrate the Tale of Melebeus suggests the prudent and diplomatic man of affairs, interested in speculation, translator of Boethius, and in harmony with the orthodoxies of his age.

The interesting thing about the two tales, for our purposes, is the distinct not to say antagonistic interests which they represent. Chaucer's portrait of himself reminds us of two distinct Chaucers, as it were, with well-known habits and traits, one a courtly-romancer, the other a prudent philosopher. Now we have already seen how standards of the seemly and moral tended to differentiate themselves in the pilgrims' actual behavior as in mediaeval society generally. It was an age when old verities were beginning to be tampered with, and in no area was the challenge to the Church's authority more blatant than in courtly-love literature, with its counter-religion for governing the relation of the sexes. To be sure, intellectual speculation was endemic to the age, but as Professor Powicke has observed, a speculative or even a sceptical bent in the intellectual matters was both socially and morally acceptable.[37] It was only when ideological or biological pressures seriously affected social conduct that the ecclesiastical authority was apt to intervene. It is true that the Sir Thopas doggerel is not a courtly-love poem, but it certainly calls to mind the Chaucer

[36] See B. H. Bronson, 'Chaucer's Art in Relation to His Audience", *Five Studies in Literature* (University of California Publications in English VIII, 1940), pp. 1-53; Ruth Crosby, "Oral Delivery in the Middle Ages", *Speculum*, XIII (1936), 88-110, and "Chaucer and the Custom of Oral Delivery", *ibid.*, XIII (1938),413-32.

[37] F. M. Powicke, "The Christian Life", *Legacy of the Middle Ages*, p. 26.

who had written such poems, and who in his youth, as Ten Brink suggested, may have written frankly erotic verse.[38] Though perfectly seemly, this kind of literature was morally unjustifiable, just as it would be morally questionable for a Christian philosopher to be publishing the low tales of the "cherles." To retain our sociological terminology, we can say that Chaucer's courtly-love poetry was an ideological deviation while the farcical tales represented a deviation brought about by biological factors. And we find that it is precisely these two kinds of writings that Chaucer eventually retracts.

In other words, the two tales he assigns himself remotely reflect what eventually came to be a very real dilemma for Chaucer. Essentially the tales imply the antagonism which focused for Chaucer around the counterclaims of the artistic and the prudential orders. With apologies relating to literary or social standards we need not be concerned, for example, with Chaucer's apologies in the General Prologue for not being able to repeat the tales verbatim and for not presenting the pilgrims in the order of their social rank. But the apology in the prologue to the Miller's Tale is another matter, since it strikes directly at the relation between the concepts of the seemly and the moral as held by Chaucer and his audience. Chaucer tries to justify the inclusion of the low tales which follow by appealing to the social distinction between "gentils" and "cherles"; but he is clearly uneasy, and it may not be an accident that the series suddenly breaks off. For, like the courtly-love literature, the *fabliau* genre to which the Miller's Tale and its two successors belong threatened moral and social consequences of which Chaucer could not be unaware. At one moment Chaucer decided to include the tales, for reasons which may have been morally valid; but eventually he will retract them along with his works in the courtly-love tradition.

The dilemma confronting Chaucer was given its classic theological solution in the *Summa Theologiae*:

> In the case of an art directed to the production of goods which men cannot use without sin, it follows that the workmen sin in making such things, as directly affording others an occasion of sin; for instance, if a man were to make idols or anything pertaining to idolatrous worship. But in the case of an art the products of which may be employed by a man either for good or for an evil use, such as swords, arrows, and the like, the practice of such an art is not sinful. These alone should be called arts; wherefore Chrysostom says: *the name should be applied to those only which contribute towards and produce necessaries and mainstays of life.* In the case of an art that produces things which for the most part some people put to an evil use, although such arts are not unlawful in themselves, nevertheless, according to the teaching of Plato, they should be extirpated from the state by the governing authority . . . Hence Chrysostom says that *even the shoemakers' and clothiers' arts stand in need of restraint, for they have lent their art to lust, by abusing its needs, and debasing art by art.*[39]

Here is Chaucer's problem: whether to let his art act autonomously or to order it by prudence. This problem is suggested remotely in the two tales he assigns himself, more explicitly in the Prologue to the Miller's Tale, and finally in the Retraction at the end of the *Canterbury Tales.*

I would argue, therefore, that the resort to external literary sources to explain these elements in his work is to misunderstand Chaucer's problem and his deepest convictions. It casts doubt on his originality as well as on the genuineness of his moral compunction and on his sincerity. I have tried to show that in life as in art there was apt to be a gap between what was morally and what was socially acceptable. In the end, Chaucer, like his age, gave precedence to spiritual considerations, and whatever the original motivation behind his poetic activity he ultimately came to see certain creations as likely to do more harm than their entertainment or instructional value could justify. To accuse him of mockery at this point is, in effect, to make him a more radical heretic than the most radical contemporary, and worse, it makes him a hypocrite. If, at any one point in his life, he chose to publish courtly-love tales or scatological stories for reasons about which we cannot be very clear, it is certain that from early life on there was a strong religious and prudential element in his character which led him eventually to regret the fact. Not only is there a problem as to why he would apologize if he did not mean it, but as to why in so doing Chaucer missed some of his presumed guide's most pertinent arguments, namely, those which Boccaccio made relative to the innate right of the artist to paint as he sees, to the fact that the questionable works were narrated in the spirit of play not in church, and to the didactic principle of the validity of the tales' "sentence," however crude the language in which they are expressed.[40] Furthermore, Boccaccio expresses no sentiment of regret; he is explaining and justifying. The motive behind Chaucer's action, confirming the interpretation we have given the data, is identified in the phrasing of his final Retraction, namely, that he would like to withdraw "the tales of Canterbury, thilke that sownen into synne."

---

[38] Bernhard Ten Brink, *History of English Literature* II (New York, 1893), p. 41.

[39] *Summa Theologiae* II-II, q. 169, a. 2, ad 4.

Similarly Professor Tatlock's far-ranging search for an "apologetic tradition" to explain the Retraction itself at the end of the *Canterbury Tales* and of the passage at the end of *Troilus and Criseyde*, which he describes, misleadingly I believe, as "very like a Retraction," arises from the application of modern distinctions between art and prudence to mediaeval texts. Nor can Boccaccio's *Filostrato* account for the tone and intent of Chaucer's renunciation of courtly-love ideals in the epilogue to *Troilus*. As Professor Young pointed out, Chaucer addresses the epilogue to men *and women* and substitutes for Boccaccio's warning to men regarding faithless women, "a moving Christian appeal to amorous young people" of which the *Filostrato* contains no hint.[41] It is significant that a later fifteenth-century tract addressed to a nun cites Troilus' story as containing an instance of the type of "fleshly love" that is to be avoided.[42] Thus the so-called "retraction" of *Troilus* is an obviously sincere statement of Chaucer's final view of such "worldly vanities" and confirms by anticipation the more sweeping and genuine Retraction of all his works in the courtly-love tradition at the end of the *Canterbury Tales.*

Finally, I would like to say a word on what appears to me the significant thing about the *Canterbury Tales* relative to mediaeval behavior. Beneath the coarseness of the language and conduct centering around sexual relations, there lies, I believe, Chaucer's deep concern for answers to the social ills he saw about him. Among the pilgrims represented, none, with the possible exceptions of the Clerk and Chaucer himself, could be expected to give the profound social pressures at work the disinterested consideration they deserved. The Host, for example, raised but could not solve a whole cluster of social and moral questions connected with the celibate ideal when he commented so entertainingly on the ethnological qualities of the monk. Confronted by social ills and dilemmas whose meaning they only vaguely comprehended, the pilgrims could only react in a spirit of horse-play or of lofty idealism, as the tales Chaucer assigned them suggest. In assigning the *Tale of Melibeus* to himself, Chaucer was acting more appropriately, I think, than many critics have recognized. Stemming ultimately from the same tradition as Boethius' *Consolation,* the book of Melibeus was translated into French, perhaps by Jean de Meun, and was eventually incorporated into *Le ménagier de Paris,*[43] which we have mentioned earlier as representing a new concept of the ideal marriage. The tale is closely akin to the Clerk's Griselde story and at least distantly related to the tradition from which the Parson's Tale derives. Its central theme is, of course, the vital role of prudence in governing human conduct and is an indirect censure of those overly preoccupied with worldly "honor" at the expense of the true honor to be derived from a good name, patience, and interior peace. Perhaps not enough attention has been given by critics to the elaborate preparation Chaucer made, so far as the re-constructed text indicates, by way of the Clerk's Tale, his own Melibeus Tale, and the Parson's Prologue and Tale, for the final Retraction. The shift from worldly to spiritual matters is much less abrupt than in *Troilus*, during the writing of which he already had the *Canterbury Tales* in mind.[44] And it should be noted that when he proposed to write a "comedye," it is very probable he meant a work dealing with "low," that is, real life rather than with the high and remote matter of *Troilus*. He will, that is, point his moral in a more direct and familiar way. It seems to me likely that Chaucer included the "cherles" tales not only for their dramatic interest but also for the underlying seriousness of their implied comment on contemporary conduct. Beneath the wonderful urbanity and humor of the *Canterbury Tales* there is Chaucer's deep sense of social injustices and evils, a sense not as remote from Langland's as a superficial glance might suggest. In the final prologue and tale the Parson rejects the Host's request for a fable, disparages rhyme, and proposes instead "to knytte up al this feeste, and make an ende." Thus the tale itself performs the same function as the epilogue to *Troilus and Criseyde*: it orients the reader to all that has gone before in the light of him that "sit in hevene above," as Chaucer put it at the end of *Troilus*:

---

[40] G. Boccaccio, *The Decameron*, ed. W. E. Henley, introduction Edward Hutton (Tudor Translations, London, 1907), p. 370 ff.

[41] Karl Young, "Chaucer's Renunciation of Love in Troilus", *MLN*, XL (1925), 272.

[42] Willis Wager, "'Fleshly Love' in Chaucer's 'Troilus'," *MLR*, XXXIV (1939), 62-66.

And Jhesu, for his grace, wit me sende
To shewe yow the wey, in this viage,
Of thilke parfit glorious pilgrymage
That highte Jerusalem celestial.

On this level the "seemly" is absorbed into the identified with moral and religious ideals. Even in his early poetry Chaucer could strike the profoundly religious as well as the erotic note. The same Boethius who taught Chaucer how to view objectively the human follies so abundantly present in the *Canterbury Tales*, taught him also how to view himself and his poetry objectively. In a sense, Chaucer's society could accept much that we do not accept as seemly because this society attached less importance to conventions that appeared to them as ephemeral as life itself. I think we need look no further for the "source" of Chaucer's apologies and retractions than that which he himself gives us in his translation of Boethius:

> And whan she saugh thise poetical Muses aprochen aboute my bed and enditynge wordes to my wepynges, sche was a litel amoeved, and glowede with cruel sighen. "Who," quod sche, "hath suffred aprochen to this sike man thise comune strompettes of swich a place that men depen the theatre; the whiche not oonly ne asswagen noght his sorwes with none remedies, but thei wolden fedyn and noryssen hym with sweete venym . . . But goth now rather awey, ye mermaydenes, whiche that ben swete til it be at the laste, and suffreth this man to ben cured and heeled by myne muses."[45]

---

[43] See Robinson's comments in *Works*, pp. 846-47.

[44] *The Book of Troilus and Criseyde* V, 1837-44 and 1786-88, ed. R. K. Root (Princeton, 1926).

[45] *Works*, "Boece", I, M.1, Pr.1, 48-58 and 75-78.

In Chaucer's age the seemly was subordinated ultimately to a religious view. The "mermaydenes," though they might anoint things "with hony swetnesse of Rhetorik and Musike," as Boethius, following Plato, says in Chaucer's translation,[46] when viewed from another level were but common strumpets. That other level, the religious level, Chaucer also knew, and the Tale of Melibeus is itself adequate defense of the need for prudence in adjusting the vision of the one to the complexities of the other. It seems to me that to describe Chaucer's sensitivities in these matters as arising from a "narrowly pious impulse" is to miss the point. I suspect that what makes *Troilus and Criseyde* and the *Canterbury Tales* everlastingly interesting is precisely that tension between the demands of art and the demands of prudence in Chaucer's nature which would not permit him to rest either in hollow literary conventions or in hollow moral platitudes. These works are instinct with that duality which lies at the very heart of life and is the glory of great literature.

---

[46] *Works*, "Boece", II, M.2, Pr.3, 10.

John of Jandun and the Divine Causality*

ARMAND MAURER C. S. B.

AMONG the various currents of philosophy in the fourteenth century Latin Averroism was one of the least forward-looking and progressive. Thoroughly tied to the tradition of Averroes, it moved for the most part in a closed circle, impermeable to new ideas and ways of thought.[1] Its conservatism becomes quite clear when its most representative figure, John of Jandun, is compared with his contemporary and associate, William of Ockham. While Jandun was looking back to the tradition of Aristotle as interpreted by Averroes, and expending his talents in attempting to understand it correctly, Ockham was trying new experiments in philosophy and laying the basis of modern ways of thought.

It is nonetheless true that the Averroist movement, initiated at Paris in the second half of the thirteenth century, exercised considerable influence throughout the later Middle Ages and the Renaissance, especially in the schools of northern Italy.[2] Its characteristic themes in psychology, natural philosophy, and metaphysics were continually debated and widely upheld. More generally, its sharp opposition of faith and reason and its rationalist approach to problems of philosophy permeated the intellectual atmosphere of the time and even influenced thinkers like Pomponazzi who, strictly speaking, did not belong to the Averroist school.[3] Indeed, this general influence of Averroism extends to our own day.

John of Jandun's Disputed Question on the divine causality, edited in the appendix to the present article, illustrates well the Averroist approach to a metaphysical problem. It exhibits the concern of the Averroists to interpret the frequently ambiguous texts of Aristotle in the light of Averroes' commentaries, and to understand correctly the often obscure statements of Averroes himself. It also reveals their concern to set aside revelation in discussing a philosophical problem and to appeal to the philosophers alone for a solution, which they generally interpret to be in opposition to the teaching of faith.

Jandun's Disputed Question is also significant in the history of the notion of efficient causality. Descartes was to pass on to modern philosophy the notion of an efficient cause with a "positive influence" upon its effect.[4] To be more precise, he distinguished between two types of efficient causes. The first simply brings about a change in its effect, in such a way that the effect can remain even when the cause is no longer present. In this way the architect is the cause of a house and the father the cause of his son. These are causes, Descartes says, only *secundum fieri* and not *secundum esse*, because they make the effect come to be without precisely giving it its being. The second type of efficient cause produces the very being of its effect, so that if the cause is

---

* This article represents a section of work done as a Fellow of the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation.

[1] Cf. E. Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1955), p. 522.

[2] Cf. E. Renan, *Averroès et l'averroïsme* (Paris, 1925); J. R. Charbonnel, *La Pensée italienne au XVIe siècle et le courant libertin* (Paris, 1919), pp. 160-170, 220-388; H. Busson, *Les Sources et le développement du rationalisme dans la littérature française de la renaissance (1539-1601)* (Paris 1922); B. Nardi, *Sigieri di Brabante nei pensiero del Rinascimento italiano* (Rome, 1945); *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man*, ed. E. Cassirer, P. O. Kristeller, J. Randall Jr. (Chicago, 1948), pp. 8-20; P. Renucci, *L'Aventure de l'humanisme européen au moyen-âge (IV-XIV siècle)* (Paris, 1953), pp. 151-158.

[3] Pomponazzi is often called an Averroist, although he himself was a bitter opponent of Averroes. Cf. his *De Immortalitate animae*, 4 (Tübingen, 1791), pp. 7-21. For his opposition of faith and reason, cf. W. Betzendörfer, *Die Lehre von der zweifachen Wahrheit bei Petrus Pomponatius* (Tübingen, 1919).

[4] Cf. R. Descartes, *Correspondance* 233, éd. Adam-Tannery, *Oeuvres de Descartes* III (Paris, 1899), p. 336.

removed the effect itself ceases to be. In this way the sun causes light and God causes all created things. These are causes *secundum esse*. And because God stands in this relation to His creatures, His continual influence is needed in order that they be conserved in being; a fact, Descartes adds, of which the unlettered are often ignorant, but which is evident to all metaphysicians.[5]

Descartes' conception of efficient causality and of God's causal relation to the universe, like so much of his metaphysics, if not his method, had its source in mediaeval philosophy, more exactly in St. Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, who in turn inherited it from Avicenna.[6] Not all mediaeval philosophers, however, would have agreed with Descartes that this notion of divine causality is an evident metaphysical truth. There were some, like Averroes and John of Jandun, who rejected it as stemming from revelation, and so outside the domain of rational thought. In proof of this they pointed to the fact that Aristotle, the Philosopher *par excellence*, always described an efficient cause as simply the starting-point of motion: he knew nothing of an efficient cause which imparts *being* to its effect, or of such a causal relation of God to the universe.[7]

The history of this conflict of views in the Middle Ages on the nature of efficient causality has not yet been fully written,[8] although it is important for an understanding of the modern controversy over efficient causality and of the impact of revelation on the development of modern philosophical ideas. Indeed, this history cannot be fully written until all the pertinent documents are made available. It is with the hope of making a slight contribution to the subject that Jandun's treatise on the divine causality is here edited. The treatise is a *Quaestio Disputata*: "Is it contradictory for eternal beings to have an efficient cause?"[9] Jandun treated of similar and related problems in several of his commentaries on Aristotle.[10] The present Question, although it does not always have the orderly presentation of ideas of the commentaries, is quite unique in its presentation and handling of the problem. It bears the mark of the classroom dispute of which it is the written record; but just for this reason it is important for showing us the various sides of the controversy in his day, and the position which he himself adopted.

The background of the dispute contained in Jandun's treatise is the conflict between the conceptions of efficient causality of Avicenna and Averroes. A word must be said on this subject before introducing Jandun's own treatment of the question.[11]

Avicenna conceived an efficient cause as that which gives being to something distinct from itself: *Agens vero est causa quae acquirit rei esse discretum a seipso.*[12] More briefly, it is that from which being comes: *id a quo provenit esse.*[13]

---

[5] Cf. R. Descartes, *Responsio ad Quintas Objectiones, ed. cit.*, VII, p. 369; N. K. Smith, *New Studies in the Philosophy of Descartes* (London, 1952), p. 204. For further references to Descartes' conception of efficient causality, cf. E. Gilson, *Index Scolastico-Cartésien* (Paris, 1912), pp. 39-40.

[6] There are, however, important differences in their notions of causality. On the subject of Descartes and the scholastics, cf. E. Gilson, *Etudes sur le rôle de la pensée médiévale dans la formation du système cartésien* (Paris, 1930), pp. 226-227. For texts of St. Thomas on efficient causality, cf. L. Schütz, *Thomas-Lexikon* (Paderborn, 1895), pp. 103-109; F. Meehan, *Efficient Causality in Aristotle and St. Thomas* (Washington, 1940), pp. 152-398. For Duns Scotus; cf. M. Garcia, *Lexicon-Scholasticum Philosophico - Theologicum* (Quaracchi, 1910), pp. 125-129. For Avicenna, cf. *infra*, pp. 186-187.

[7] Cf. *infra*, pp. 188-190.

[8] See the penetrating study on this subject in E. Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy* . . . pp. 210-211; 643-644.

[9] Cf. *infra*, Appendix, p. 198.

[10] *In II Metaph.*, 5 (Venice, 1505), fols. 28^{v}-30^{r}: Utrum substantiae aeternae aliae a prima dependeant a prima tanquam ab aliquo agente et efficiente; *In VIII Phys.*, 5 (Venice, 1586), pp. 197-199: An motus aeternus dependeat a motore aliquo effective; *In I De Caelo et Mundo*, 15 (Venice, 1552), fols. 11^{r}-12^{r}: An caelum ab aliquo dependeat tanquam ab agente et efficiente proprio; *In De Substantia Orbis* 14 (Venice, 1552), fol. 60^{r}: An intelligentiae dependeant a primo principio in ratione efficientis vel finis; *ibid.*, 10, fols. 56^{v}-57^{r}: An caeli motor sit idem secundum agens et secundum finem, vel utrum in separatis a materia, efficiens et finis differant vel sint idem.

[11] Cf. E. Gilson, *ibid.*

[12] Avicenna, *Metaph.* VI, 1 (Venice, 1508), fol. 91^{rb}.

[13] *Avicennae Metaphysices Compendium*, ed. N. Carame (Rome, 1926), p. 34, n. 2.

In the mediaeval Latin translation of his works the Arabic word for this cause (*'Illa fa 'ila*) is rendered either *causa agens* or *causa efficiens*.[14]

Although, according to Avicenna, all efficient causes give being, not all of them are *true* causes of being. A natural efficient cause gives being to something only in the sense that it moves or changes it; it is simply a source of motion: *principium motionis tantum*.[15] This is the type of efficient cause studied by the philosopher of nature, who deals with the moving and changing universe. Besides this type of efficient cause there is another, studied by the metaphysician, which is the source or giver of being: *principium essendi et datorem ejus*.[16] This manner of giving being is called creation—a mode of communication proper not only to God, who according to Avicenna immediately creates only one being (the first celestial Intelligence), but also to all the subsequent Intelligences. Each of these creates in turn the Intelligence immediately inferior to it, along with the animated celestial sphere with which it is intimately connected. The last of these Intelligences, which is the Agent Intellect, creates, or gives being to, the sublunary world and individual souls.[17]

Every true and essential cause, precisely because its effect depends on it for its very existence, must be simultaneous with its effect. It is a rule for Avicenna that every cause, in the true sense of the word, must co-exist with its effect and not precede it, as do the causes of motion: *unaquaeque igitur causa est simul cum suo causato*. Only non-essential and remote causes precede their effects in existence, in such a way that those effects can remain when the causes are removed.[18]

Thus Avicenna distinguished between two radically different types of efficient causes: one necessarily connected with change and motion, the other transcending motion and connected simply with being. The first is "natural", the second "metaphysical" causality. Algazel, in his summary of Avicenna's philosophy, described these types of causes in succinct terms for future philosophers.[19]

Avicenna's notion of efficient causality found a resolute critic in Averroes. He objected basically to Avicenna's mixing religion and revelation with philosophy, and he made a deliberate effort to purify it of whatever doctrines derived from these sources.[20] One such doctrine was creation *ex nihilo*, and with it the Avicennian conception of an efficient cause which gives not motion or change but being. He saw clearly that this notion could not be found in Aristotle's philosophy, to which he was consciously trying to return.

Averroes distinguished between two types of active causes: a mover (*movens*) and an agent (*agens*). A moving cause properly produces only local motion. An agent, on the other hand, produces qualitative changes or alterations. The term "moving cause" is wider than "agent." All agents are movers, but not all movers are agents. Only those are agents which, besides moving bodies locally, reduce matter from potency to act and thus produce a composite of form and matter.[21] Averroes wished to avoid what he considered to be two extreme positions on this question. One was that of Empedocles, who conceived agent causes simply as movers, whose function it is to separate what is united in nature and thus reveal forms hidden within it. At the other extreme Averroes saw the upholders of creation, who imagine that an agent can create a whole being from nothing. In this theory a creator is a being who does not need matter on which to operate; the whole possibility of the effect resides on the part of the agent, without any potential subject which is reduced from possibility to act. As examples of the creationists Averroes gives the Mutakallimun (Moslem theologians), Christians such as Philoponus, and Avicenna, according to whom forms are not educed from the potency of matter, but created and placed in matter by a "giver of forms" (*dator formarum*).[22]

---

[14] Cf. A. M. Goichon, *Lexique de la langue philosophique d'Ibn Sina (Avicenne)*, (Paris, 1938), p. 238, n. 448, 3.

[15] *Avicenna, Metaph.* VI, 1, fol. 91^{rb}.

[16] *Ibid.* Peter of Auvergne, a disciple of St. Thomas, expressed this type of efficient cause with the striking formula: *unde principium esse*, obviously paralleling the Aristotelian formula for a moving cause: *unde principium motus*. Cf. W. Dunphy, *The Doctrine of Causality in the Quaestiones in Metaphysicam of Peter of Auvergne* (unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Toronto, 1953), p. 80.

[17] For Avicenna's doctrine of creation, cf. A. M. Goichon, *La Distinction de l'essence et de l'existence d'après Ibn Sina (Avicenne)* (Paris, 1937), pp. 201-334; L. Gardet, *La pensée religieuse d' Avicenne (Ibn Sina)* (Paris, 1951), pp. 62-68.

[18] Avicenna, *Metaph.* VI, 2, fol. 91^{rb}. Verae causae simul sunt cum suis causatis. Sed praecedentes sunt causae vel per accidens vel adiutrices. *Ibid.*

[19] Algazel, *Metaph.* I, 8; ed. J. T. Muckle (Toronto, 1933), pp. 47-51. It is interesting to note that Descartes illustrates these causes with the same examples that Algazel used five centuries before. (Cf. *supra*, pp. 185-186. Cf. Avicenna, *ibid.*

[20] On the relation between faith and reason in Averroes, cf. L. Gauthier, *La Théorie d'Ibn Rochd (Averroès) sur les rapports de la religion et de la philosophie* (Paris, 1909); same author, *Ibn Rochd (Averroès)* (Paris, 1948), pp. 41-42; E. Gilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 218-220.

To these two positions on the role of an agent Averroes opposed what he considered the opinion of Aristotle, which he adopted as his own. According to this view, an agent produces only a composite of matter and form, and it does this by moving and changing matter until the form potentially present becomes actual.[23] Averroes does not seem to have conceived a true agent as a giver of being or form, but simply as a source of motion or change. He thus eliminated from his philosophy the "metaphysical" efficient cause of Avicenna, which is not a principle of change but a source of existence itself. It is true, however, that at times he uses the term "agent" in another sense, extending it to include an immaterial being like God as the cause of the very form or essence of its effect. In this higher sense of the term, he says, the agent cause is studied in metaphysics, not in the philosophy of nature.[24] We shall have to return later to the meaning of "agent" in this sense, and to the controversy it provoked among the interpreters and followers of Averroes.[25]

It is against the background of this dispute over the meaning of an efficient cause that we must read John of Jandun's treatise on the possibility of something eternal having an efficient cause. The question is well designed to bring out a philosopher's conception of efficient causality. If an efficient cause is nothing else than the source of motion or change, how can it cause something eternal? Must it not be prior in time to that which it changes and reduces from potency to act? And if that is true, how can its effect have always existed? On the other hand, if an efficient cause can simply give being, without motion or change, its relationship to its effect transcends time, and there seems to be no contradiction in its effect being eternal.

Jandun himself reports three opinions on this question. The first is the view of Avicenna and Algazel, that all eternal beings other than God have an efficient cause. The second view maintains that nothing eternal has such a cause. The third, which we shall see is Jandun's own, holds a position midway between these two extremes.[26]

---

[21] Agens enim est movens et faciens passiones. . . . Movens autem proprie nullam facit passionem; quapropter omne agens est movens, sed non omne movens est agens. Averroes, *In XII Metaph.*, t. c. 23; *Opera Omnia* VIII (Venice, 1574), 308K. Unless otherwise indicated, all references to Averroes are to this edition. Cf. *In I De Generatione et Corruptione*, t. c. 45; V, 361G; *In III Phys.* t. c. 3; IV, 86K; *Epitomes in Metaph.* 1; VIII, 356K.

[22] Cf. Averroes, *In XII Metaph.* t. c. 18, 304E-I. On this point, cf. L. Gardet, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

[23] Tertia autem est opinio Aristotelis. Et est quod agens non facit nisi compositum ex materia et forma, et hoc fit movendo materiam et transmutando eam donec exeat de ea illud quod est de potentia in ea ad illam formam in actu . . . agens apud Aristotelem non est congregans inter duo in rei veritate, sed extrahens illud quod est in potentia ad actum. Averroes, *Ibid*, 356H-I.

[24] Hinc est quod haec scientia (*scil.* metaphysica) non praestat de causis nisi formam et finem, et aliquo modo agens: videlicet non eo modo quo dicitur agens in rebus transmutabilibus, quia conditio agentis in hoc loco non est quod praecedat passum praecessione temporali, sicut fit in rebus naturalibus. Averroes, *Epitomes in Metaph.* 1; VIII, 356I; cf. 4, 388M-389A.

[25] Cf. *infra*, pp. 193-197.

[26] Cf. *infra*, Appendix, p. 199.

Avicenna's position, Jandun says, is that God exists eternally as the most self-sufficient and adequate cause. No defect is to be found in Him, and there is no impediment to stand in the way of His realizing His effects. Granted that He exists eternally, then, it follows that His effects also exist eternally; and so there are eternal beings which have an efficient cause.[27]

In his reply Jandun comes immediately to the crucial point. There are, he says, only two ways in which eternal beings could have an efficient cause: through motion and change, or through simple emanation or creation. Now it is impossible that they be caused in the first way, because this manner of efficiency requires matter as the subject of change, and the Intelligences, which Avicenna supposes are eternally created, are immaterial. Moreover, an efficient cause which produces its effect through motion and change must precede it in time, and consequently the effect cannot be eternal. So these eternal beings cannot be brought into existence through any kind of motion or change. The other possibility is that they are simply created by God out of nothing. But this is contrary to Aristotle, who made it clear that something cannot be made from nothing. In neither of these two ways, then, can eternal beings have an efficient cause.[28]

In the present treatise Jandun does not explain further his opposition to creation as a mode of efficient causation. Elsewhere, however, he adds that reason and faith are opposed on this point. Reason takes its origin in the objects of sense, and consequently it cannot demonstrate what is above the sensible and natural order. Now creation, or the simple emanation of being, is a supernatural mode of production, and it can never be known by reasoning from the order of nature. Jandun stoutly maintains his belief in the veracity of the Scriptural account of God's creating all things in the beginning of time, and hence in a mode of efficient causality beyond that known to the philosopher. But he would have us notice two things: First, according to Scripture God's creation is not eternal; it had a temporal beginning. Thus even according to revelation God is not the efficient cause of *eternal* beings. Secondly, creation is called a "production" in a sense equivocal to causation through motion and change. It is not the type exercised by a natural agent, which is alone known to the philosopher whose method of inquiry is purely natural.[29]

To be convinced of the fact, we have only to read Aristotle, who, Jandun says, always speaks of a true efficient cause as a principle of motion.[30] Indeed, the very definition of an agent is "the source of motion and change." So whatever does not come into being by motion cannot have a true efficient cause. If anyone denies this, Jandun refuses to dispute with him, although he does try to justify his own position by means of an inductive reasoning.[31] Consequently he agrees with Averroes that the modern way of explaining the production of beings, as an immediate creation by God as by a true efficient cause, is simply not true: *Modus modernorum in producendo entia non est verus.*[32] The opposition between the teaching of faith and the philosophers is thus complete.

---

[27] *Ibid.* On the necessity of creation according to Avicenna, cf. L. Gardet, *op. cit.*, p. 42; E. Gilson, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

[28] Cf. *infra*, Appendix, p. 201. Cf. Aristotle, *Physics* I, 4, 187a29.

[29] Hoc modo dicendum est ad quaestionem secundum intentionem Aristotelis et Commentatoris ponentium citra primum aliquas substantias aeternas; et si hoc esset verum, non dependeret a vero agente per motum. Sed tamen dicendum secundum fidem et veritatem quod nihil citra primum est aeternum, sed omnia inceperunt de novo esse. Et per consequens producta fuerunt a primo principio tanquam ab agente per creationem ex nihilo, saltem substantiae abstractae. Et illa creatio non est motus nec generatio univoce dictus cum motu inferiorum, sed alia productio supernaturalis quae non potest convinci ex sensatis et ex naturalibus, ex quibus procedunt philosophi naturaliter loquentes. Sed tantum firmiter hoc credo et scio, non de ratione orta ex sensatis, et hoc firmiter facit scripturae doctoribus reverenter assentire. Unde ex hoc quod nescio demonstrare ex sensatis, nec potest, quia est super sensibilia et naturam, tunc simpliciter credendo et fideliter habeo meritum, et in hoc etiam probatur creationis et salvationis excellentia vigoris super agens quodlibet naturale. Jandun, *In II Metaph.* 5, fols. 29^{vb}-30^{ra}.

Texts on creation from Jandun's Commentary on the *Physics* will be found in E. Gilson, "La doctrine de la double vérité", *Etudes de philosophie médiévale* (Strasbourg, 1921), 74-75. On Jandun's mocking attitude towards the faith, cf. p. 67; same author, *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1955), pp. 523-524.

[30] Cf. Aristotle, *Metaph.* V, 2, 1013a29; *Physics* II, 3, 194b29-31. For Aristotle's doctrine of efficient causality, cf. A. Mansion, *Introduction à la physique aristotélicienne* (Louvain, 1946), pp. 226-239; E. Gilson, *L'Etre et l'essence* (Paris, 1948), pp. 59-62. It should be noticed that what Aristotle describes is a moving cause; the distinction between such a cause and an "efficient" cause is due to Avicenna. Cf. E. Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy . . .*, pp. 210-211; 643, note 20. On Aristotle's lack of treatment of efficient causality from the

Jandun's quarrel with the "moderns", such as Avicenna, goes even deeper. Not only did he, like Averroes, think that Avicenna was appealing to an extra-philosophical notion when he introduced the concept of creation into metaphysics, but he considered erroneous the whole metaphysics of being connected with it. Why, indeed, would a being which always existed need an efficient cause? To this question Avicenna had replied that only God is a necessary being in the absolute sense of the word. Everything else is, in itself, or from the point of view of its essence, only possible. It is necessary only in relation to the cause which gives it actual existence. God is the only case of a being which exists in virtue of its very nature; in all other beings essence is really distinct from existence, and it is not their very nature to exist. In virtue of their natures they can exist, but an efficient cause is required to give them their existence. This is true even for eternal beings like the heavenly Intelligences. In themselves they are only possible beings; if they are to exist, they must eternally be given existence by their efficient causes.[33]

Like his master Averroes, Jandun could not accept the notion of being presupposed by this argument. Suppose Avicenna were correct in thinking it possible for an eternal being not to exist. Since nothing impossible follows from what is possible, it could be posited that, at a certain moment, it might not exist. But at that moment it would exist, since in fact it is eternal. Therefore, at one and the same time, the thing would both exist and not exist, which is contradictory. Consider, too, that any moment might be chosen for this hypothetical experiment. It then becomes evident that, on the strength of Avicenna's argument, we can say that for all eternity a certain being both exists and does not exist—which plainly violates the law of non-contradiction.[34]

The very notions of being and possibility are here at stake. For Jandun, as for Averroes, an eternal substance is formally, by its very nature, a necessary being.[35] It cannot be a possible being by virtue of its nature, as Avicenna imagined, for then it would acquire eternity and necessity when brought into existence by its cause, with the result that a possible nature would be changed into a necessary nature.[36] This seems to be the reason, incidentally, why Aver-

---

point of view of existential act, cf. J. Owens, *The Doctrine of Being in the Aristotelian Metaphysics* (Toronto, 1951), pp. 221-222.

[31] Omne agens simpliciter est principium motus et mutationis; et illud intelligitur per quid nominis hujus quod est causa agens. Et qui negaret hoc, non esset disputandum cum eo. Et tamen potest declarari inductione. . . . Ubicumque Aristoteles loquitur de efficiente vero, dicit ipsum unde principium motus; quicquid ergo non fit per motum, non habet efficiens verum. Jandun, *In II Metaph.* 5, fols. 28^{vb}, 29^{rb}.

[32] *Ibid.*, fol. 29^{rb}. Cf. Averroes, *In XII Metaph.* t. c. 44, 328D.

[33] For Avicenna's notion of necessary and possible being, cf. *Metaph.* I, 7-8, fols. 73^{ra}-74^{ra}; VIII, 4, fols. 98^{vb}-99^{rb}. Cf. also A. M. Goichon, *op. cit.*, pp. 156-200; L. Gardet, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-61; E. Gilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 207-208; 212-213.

[34] Cf. *infra*, Appendix, pp. 201-202. For Averroes' criticism of Avicenna's notion of being, cf. *In IV Metaph.* t. c. 3, 67B-H; *In XII Metaph.* t. c. 41, 324K. Avicenna's logic is not at fault; nor would it lead him to this conclusion. For him, it is not contradictory for something to be eternally possible in virtue of its essence and eternally necessary in virtue of the cause which makes it exist, for created essence is really distinct from existence. Having denied with Averroes Avicenna's distinction of essence and existence, Jandun cannot admit his distinction between possibility and necessity within created being.

[35] Cf. Jandun, *In De Sub. Orbis* 14, fol. 60^{ra}. Cf. Averroes, *De Sub. Orbis* 3, 9DE.

[36] Cf. Jandun, *ibid.*; *infra*, Appendix, p. 205. Cf. Averroes, *In XII Metaph.* t. c. 41, 423K; H. A. Wolfson, "Averroes' Lost Treatise on the Prime Mover", *The Hebrew Union College Annual* XXIII, 1 (1950-51),

roes and Jandun did not admit, with Avicenna, that the heavenly bodies are really composed of matter and form, like sublunary bodies. If matter were an integral part of their natures, they would contain a root of possibility, since whatever is material is potential. They considered the heavenly bodies "material" only in an equivocal sense, since their "matter" is of a different sort from that of sublunary bodies; and they thought these bodies were composed, not of matter and form, but of a mover and a subject which is moved.[37]

Nothing could show more clearly the gulf between the Avicennian and Averroist notions of being and possibility. For Avicenna, the essence of a created being is not its existence, and so he would not agree that a nature or essence which is possible *in itself* is changed into a necessary one by receiving necessary existence from its efficient cause. The nature always remains possible in itself; the necessity of an eternal being resides solely on the side of the existence given to it by its cause. For Averroes, on the other hand, whom Jandun follows, there is no real distinction between essence and existence. A possible being which becomes necessary through the agency of a cause would thus be fundamentally altered *in essence.*

Must it be said, then, that nothing eternal has an efficient cause? Jandun will not go as far as this, although he reports this to be the opinion of some philosophers.[38] Does not Aristotle prove that motion is eternal, and is it not clear to the senses that motion has an efficient cause? It would seem, then, that at least eternal motion is efficiently produced.[39] Jandun points out, however, that motion is not a substance, but the accident of a substance. So, even though eternal motion has an efficient cause, it still remains true that no eternal *substance* has a cause of this sort. Notice, too, that motion is not a permanent, but a successive accident. A permanent accident is one whose being requires the simultaneous actual existence of all its parts, like the quantity of the heavens and the nature of light. A successive accident is one which need not have all its parts present at once; some exist only in potency so that they are in a constant process of becoming. Now it is impossible for eternally permanent accidents to have an efficient cause, for the same reason that it is impossible for an eternal substance to have one. But successive accidents, like motion, do have an efficient cause, even though they are eternal.[40]

What is the efficient cause or mover of the never-ending successive phases of the movement of the heavens? Jandun thinks that it is not God, but rather the Intelligence presiding over the first sphere. This Intelligence, in its eternal knowledge and love of God and its desire to conserve its likeness to Him, efficiently moves the first mobile sphere. According to Jandun, God is thus the first cause of motion only as a final cause and not as an efficient cause. The efficient mover of the celestial sphere is the Intelligence presiding over it.[41]

700-702.

[37] Ideo videtur dicendum secundum Aristotelem et Commentatorem quod caelum . . . non componitur ex materia et forma, sed est corpus simplex actu existens subjectum suo motori vel motoribus, ita quod non est potentia ad esse, nec habet esse formaliter a motore vel ab alia forma, sed solum est in eo potentia ad ubi. Jandun, *op. cit.*, 1, fol. 51^{vb}. Cf. *In I De Caelo et Mundo* 23, fols. 14^{v}-16^{v}. Cf. Avicenna, *Metaph.* IX, 4, fols. 104^{vb}-105^{ra}.

[38] I have not been able to identify these philosophers. The position Jandun reports them as holding was adopted by Gregory of Rimini, who died thirty years after Jandun, in 1358. Cf. *infra*, p. 204.

[39] Cf. *infra*, Appendix, p. 192. Cf. Aristotle, *Physics* VIII, 1, 250b11-251b27.

[40] Cf. *infra*, Appendix, p. 205.

[41] Secundo dico quod primum movens, quod est movens mediate, movet in ratione finis tantum, et non in ratione efficientis, ut patet per Philosophum et Commentatorem II *Caelo*. Quod enim est nobile et perfectum simpliciter non eget actione extrinseca in acquisitione nobilitatis, quia non eget assimilari alicui, ex quo est simpliciter primum, et a se est omnis nobilitas et omnis perfectio . . . intelligentia quae movet primum orbem aliud est a primo principio. . . . Ergo apparet primum mobile moveri effective ab intelligentia desiderante et intelligente primum . . . praeter primum sit alius motor conjunctus, qui movet effective. Jandun, *In De Sub. Orbis* 10, fol. 56^{vb}. Cf. Aristotle, *De Caelo* II, 12, 292a21-292b6; Averroes, *In II De Caelo*, t.c. 63, 141KL; 64, 142H-I.

Jandun presents this doctrine as his interpretation of Aristotle's and Averroes' conception of the divine causality. As he himself indicates, the correct understanding of their position was a matter of dispute at the time. Indeed, shortly afterwards Gregory of Rimini attacked Jandun's interpretation on two scores. His first disagreement may seem at first sight a mere dispute over words, but it is important as reflecting Gregory's allegiance to Ockham in refusing to attribute any reality to universals.[42] The question Jandun had raised was: Has anything eternal an efficient cause? He had replied that no eternal *substance* has such a cause, but motion has, and motion is something eternal: *motus est aliquid aeternum.* So in a sense it can be said that something eternal has an efficient cause.[43]

Gregory of Rimini protests that to conceive motion as "something eternal" is to imagine motion as a kind of entity, shared in by all individual moving things. Many have imagined this, he adds, but in fact nothing exists in reality except individual things and their individual movements and changes. It is true that, according to Aristotle and Averroes, movements have been succeeding each other for all eternity, just as individual men have been eternally generated one after the other. We can say, then, according to these philosophers, that there always has been motion; but strictly speaking we cannot say that motion is eternal, just as we cannot say that man is eternal. To say this implies that motion and humanity have some real status apart from the individual things in motion and individual men, which is not the case. Consequently Gregory of Rimini claims that strictly speaking, according to Aristotle and Averroes, nothing eternal has an efficient cause.[44]

Jandun, however, was not to go undefended. In the sixteenth century the Averroist, Zimara, took up the debate on the side of Jandun against Gregory of Rimini. According to him, the whole eternal motion of the universe makes up a numerical unity, and this motion is efficiently produced by the celestial Intelligence charged with this function. Since this Intelligence *per se* intends the whole movement and only incidentally its parts, we can say that something eternal has a true efficient cause.[45]

The second point on which Gregory of Rimini disagrees with Jandun's interpretation of Aristotle and his Commentator regards the type of causality exercised by God on the first heavenly sphere. Jandun claimed that God transcends all the spheres, and that the immediate efficient mover of the *primum mobile* is not God, but an Intelligence inferior to Him. Gregory thinks that Aristotle and Averroes meant that God is the immediate active power of the *primum mobile*. In defense of this interpretation, Gregory reminds us that Aristotle reckoned the number of separate immobile substances according to the number of simple movements of the heavens. Averroes expressly says that the primary separate substance, or God, produces the first movement. Gregory argues that he cannot mean that God moves the first sphere only as a final cause, because in this sense He is the cause of all motion. The fact that Averroes says this movement is especially caused by God indicates that He is the efficient cause of the movement of the first sphere, and not simply its final cause.[46]

---

[42] For Gregory's relations to Ockham, cf. E. Gilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 502-503. With regard to the point at issue, Ockham had argued that motion is not a real entity, really different from that which is moved. Cf. Ockham, *In II Sent.* 9 (Lyons, 1495). Ockham differed from Gregory, however, in maintaining that, according to Aristotle, God is the efficient cause of all things. Cf. Ockham, *loc. cit.*, 6, B.

[43] Cf. *infra*, Appendix, p. 204.

[44] Ad hoc dicendum quod utique generatio habet causam agentem secundum Philosophum si recte hoc intelligatur secundum eum; tamen nulla generatio est aeterna aut fuit ab aeterno, sicut nullum genitum fuit ab aeterno sive fuit aut est aeternum. Unde secundum ipsum ista de virtute sermonis est falsa: generatio est aeterna, quia quaelibet ejus singularis est falsa, ut de se patet . . . non est considerandum quod aliqua entitas motus sit aeterna, nec quod entitas aliqua facta in mobili a motore sit aeterna, cum quaelibet singularis sit falsa. Gregory of Rimini, *In II Sent.*, 1, 1 (Venice, 1522), fol. 2^{ra} (Reprinted, St. Bonaventure, N.Y., 1955).

[45] Secundum Peripateticos, intelligentia quae est causa efficiens motus caeli per se intendit totum motum, ut est unus numero, et non intendit partes motus nisi per accidens. . . . Ergo intelligentia per se est causa effectiva totius motus. Sed totus motus est aeternus in verissima unitate numerali; ergo aliquod aeternum habet causam vere effectivam. Zimara, *Annotationes in Joannem Gandavensem super Quaest. Metaph.* (Venice, 1505), fol 174^{ra}. Gregory is referred to on fol. 173^{vb}. Zimara, however, did not think Jandun correct in saying that, according to the philosophers, God does not move the heavens immediately as its efficient cause. Cf. *ibid.*, fol. 178^{rb}.

John of Jandun was well aware that certain statements of Averroes, and even of Aristotle, would lead one at first sight to think they conceived God as a true efficient cause. Does not Aristotle refer to God, and to eternal beings in general, as causes and principles?[47] Averroes in his turn explicitly calls God a final, efficient, and formal cause. Since he expressly distinguishes between God as a final and as an efficient cause, it would seem that he means to attribute true efficient causality to Him.[48] What is more, Averroes states that God is not only the cause of the continuity of motion, but also of the very substance of what He moves.[49] This hardly seems consistent with His being solely the final cause of the motion of the heavens. Again, he asserts that the celestial bodies need not only a power giving them motion, but also the eternity of their substance.[50] So it would seem that, according to Averroes, God moves the heavens not only as a final cause—as an object of love and desire—but also as an efficient cause, giving them their very substance.

However convincing these statements may seem, Jandun thinks that to interpret them in the sense that God is a true efficient cause of an eternal substance runs counter to the philosophers' notion of efficient causality, for they always conceived this type of causality simply as a principle of motion and change. It follows that what is not subject to change, for instance the immaterial Intelligences, which are purely actual, cannot have an efficient cause. Moreover, they conceived an efficient cause as necessarily prior in time to its effect, which therefore cannot be eternal.[51]

How are we to understand, then, Averroes' statement that God is an efficient cause? Jandun appeals to Averroes' own explanation in his Commentary on the *De Caelo*, where he explicitly says that the celestial Intelligences do not exercise efficient causality in the proper sense of the term, but only formal and final causality. They can be called efficient causes only in a metaphorical sense.[53]

Jandun concludes from this that Averroes uses the term "efficient cause" in two ways: first, in its proper sense, simply as the source of motion or change; secondly, in a metaphorical sense, as equivalent to a formal or final cause. He points out that Aristotle calls health an efficient cause in this latter way: health may be said to make a person healthy, although strictly speaking health is a formal and final cause, not an efficient cause. If we call God the efficient cause of the universe of nature, it is only in this metaphorical sense. Properly He is its final cause, since He is the good to which the whole of nature tends as to its end.[53]

A formidable difficulty, however, still remains. Granted that God is the final cause of the universe, in the sense that He is the end for whose sake it functions, how can He be said to give it not only its motion, but also its very being and substance? In the world about us we are acquainted with the fact of finality. We desire something and that object is capable of moving us to action. In this case the object of desire is a cause of motion. But we have no experience of a final cause which is capable of giving to another thing its very existence. Jandun was aware of this difficulty, but he seems not to have given any solution of it. He simply states that, unlike final causes in this world, a final cause in the celestial world is not only the source of operation, but also gives and conserves being.[54] We are left in the dark as to how this is accomplished. Averroes himself seems to have considered the being of the world as consisting in its unity, order and motion. As the final cause of its order and movement, then, God gives the universe its very being.[55] Jandun does not offer this explanation, but leaves us with the mystery of an Averroist God who, as the final cause of the world, not only moves it but gives it its existence and substance.

---

[46] Philosophus et Commentator opinati sunt Deum esse motorem appropriatum primo mobili, et illud immediate active moventem. Gregory of Rimini, *loc. cit.*, fol. 3^{vb}. As the marginal note of the editor indicates, Gregory is here directly criticizing Peter of Auriol, *In I Sent.* 42, 1, 1, prop. 3 (Rome, 1596), p. 958.

The reference to Aristotle is: *Metaph.* XII, 8, 1073a21-38; to Averroes: *In XII Metaph.* t. c. 43, 326L-327A.

[47] Cf. *infra*, Appendix, notes 40-42. On the sense in which the separate substances are movers for Aristotle, cf. J. Owens, *The Doctrine of Being in the Aristotelian* Metaphysics (Toronto, 1951), pp. 280, 286, 297, 422, note 45. A useful bibliography for the controversy on the subject: J. Owens, "The Reality of the Aristotelian Separate Movers", *Review of Metaphysics*, III, (1950), 322, note 14.

[48] Cf. *infra*, Appendix, note 48.

[49] Cf. *infra*, Appendix, note 58.

[50] Cf. *infra*, Appendix, note 59.

[51] Cf. *infra*, Appendix, p. 202.

[52] Cf. *ibid.*

[53] Cf. *ibid.*

* * *

It would be beyond the limits of our present inquiry to deal adequately with the interpretation of Averroes' notion of the divine causality after John of Jandun. It might be useful, however, to add a few words on this subject, at least in so far as it is related to Jandun.

John Baconthorpe gives an excellent presentation of the various opinions of his immediate predecessors.[56] He names Harvey of Nedellec as holding that, according to Aristotle and Averroes, everything depends on God as on an efficient cause. On this point Harvey was largely inspired by St. Thomas Aquinas.[57] A certain Gerard (of Bologna?) is cited, along with others, as holding the contrary view.[58] The Averroist, Thomas of Wilton, is said to maintain an intermediate position, teaching that, although the Intelligences do not depend on God as an efficient cause, the corporeal universe does.[59] In Baconthorpe's own view, Aristotle and Averroes were of the opinion that both the Intelligences and the heavenly bodies have God for their final, and not for their efficient cause.[60] Arguing against Wilton, he makes the same distinction as Jandun between a proper and a broad use of the term "agent" in Averroes' writings. In the proper sense, Averroes does not mean God to be the efficient cause of eternal things, but only their final cause.[61] Baconthorpe's explanation of how God, as a final cause, can give eternal beings their very existence, is interesting. He says that they come into existence through the very fact that God knows He stands in different ways to them as their end. Because God exists and is their end, they too spring into existence by a sort of concomitance, as a relation comes to be along with its foundation.[62]

---

[54] Unde finis in superioribus non solum est principium operationis, sed etiam dat esse et conservat esse, licet hoc non sit in inferioribus. Jandun, *In II Metaph.* 5, fol. 29^{va}.

[55] This is the interpretation of H. A. Wolfson, *art. cit.*, 704. Cf. Averroes, *De Substantia Orbis* 4, 10I.

[56] Cf. Baconthorpe, *In II Sent.* 1, 1, 1, (Cremona, 1618), pp. 421ff.

[57] Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 421. Cf. Harvey of Nedellec, *Quodlibet* I, 8 (Venice, 1513), fols. 15^{r}-18^{v}.

Harvey follows St. Thomas in granting that Aristotle knew God to be the efficient cause of the very substance of things. Cf. *Summa Theol.* I, 44, 1-2. For St. Thomas' attitude on this point, cf. E. Gilson, *The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy* (London, 1936), pp. 68-69, 438, note 4; A. Pegis, "A Note on St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, 1, 44 1-2", *Mediaeval Studies*, VIII (1946), 159-168.

Duns Scotus, interpreting Aristotle through Avicenna, attributes to him the notion of an eternal efficient causality: Dico quod Philosophus posuit omnia alia a Deo ex se necessaria formaliter, esse effective ab eo, non tamen noviter accipiendo esse post non esse duratione, sed natura. Scotus, *Rep. Paris.* I, 8, 3; *Opera Omnia* XXII (Paris, 1894), p. 161. Cf. Scotus, *Opus Oxon.*, 2, 1 2; II (Quaracchi 1914), p. 25.

[58] *Ibid.* Cf. Gerard of Bologna, *Quodlibet* I, 9, *Ms* Vat. *lat.* 932, fol. 98^{r}-100^{r}.

[59] *Op. cit.*, p. 422. Cf. Thomas of Wilton, *Ms* Vat. *lat. Borgh.* 36, fols. 50^{v}-55^{r}. Cf. A. Maier, "Wilhelm von Alnwicks Bologneser Quaestionen gegen den Averroismus (1323)", *Gregorianum*, XXX (1949), 295-296.

[60] Videtur mihi quod tam Intelligentiae quam corpora caelestia sunt a Deo secundum opinionem Philosophi et Commentatoris non sicut a causa efficiente, sed solum sicut a fine. Baconthorpe, *In II Sent.* 1, 1, 2, n. 1, p. 424bC.

[61] Cf. *op. cit.*, 1, 1, 3, n. 2, p. 427bE-428aA.

[62] Ideo imaginatur Commentator quod

The correct interpretation of Aristotle and Averroes on this subject continued to be debated throughout the later Middle Ages and the Renaissance. At the beginning of the sixteenth century the Averroist, Achillini, defended essentially the same view as John of Jandun. He too distinguished between Averroes' proper use of the term "agent", according to which an agent is always a source of motion, drawing its effect from potency to act, and a metaphorical use of the term which extends to a formal and final cause.[63] Pomponazzi, who was Achillini's opponent at the University of Padua, took the opposite side of the debate, directing his arguments chiefly against Gregory of Rimini.[64]

The renowned Averroist, Marcantonio Zimara, played an important role in the debate. In his Annotations on Jandun's *Metaphysics* he criticized, among other things, his fellow-Averroist's interpretation on this point. It was his opinion that both Aristotle and Averroes had taught that, besides an efficient cause originating movement and change, there is another giving being by simple emanation, without the instrumentality of motion. It is in this latter way, according to them, that God eternally produces the eternal, immaterial Intelligences, and the Intelligences themselves can immediately bring into existence in time generable and corruptible things.[65]

Zimara tells us in his *Tables* on the terminology of Aristotle and Averroes that he wrote a special treatise in his youth against Gregory of Rimini and John Baconthorpe, entitled *De Triplici causalitate intelligentiae.* In this work, which he says was not published, he criticized these theologians for asserting that, according to Averroes, the movement of the heavenly bodies is eternally caused, but not their substance. He pointed out that Averroes clearly states in his *De Substantia orbis* that the heavens have not only a moving cause, but also an agent cause, which gives them their very substance. In his *Tables* he goes on to admit the difficulty of interpreting the Arabian philosopher on this point, exclaiming: *Deus sit dator auxilii in tanta perplexitate et varietate doctorum!*[66] As far as Aristotle's own doctrine is concerned, he shows some

---

secundum quod primum intelligit se esse diversimode finem eorum, quod illa aeterna statim sunt entia quaedam per solam dependentiam ad ipsum, sicut ad causam finalem, ita quod distinguuntur in diversa gradus essendi, solum per hoc, quod diversimode ordinantur ad diversa officia in ordine ad primum finem. *Loc. cit.* a. 2, n. 1, p. 425aC. Deus largiatur rebus esse secundum quod dependent in genere causae finalis; per hoc enim quod ipse est, qui est finis eorum, et ipsae sunt per quandam concomitantiam et resultationem, sicut relatio per esse fundamenti. *Loc. cit.*, a. 3, n. 3, p. 428bD.

[63] Cf. Achillini, *Liber de Intelligentiis, Quodlibetum* II, (Venice, 1545), fol. 8^{rb}.

[64] Cf. P. Pomponazzi, *In De Substantia Orbis, Ms* Vat. *Reg. lat.* 1279, fols. 29^{v}-30^{v}. Although the text of Pomponazzi is defective in places, this seems to be the position he adopts. Cf. Unde illa videtur esse sententia Aristotelis, quod, scilicet, mundus et aliae intelligentiae effective dependeant a Deo. Fol. 30^{v}. Bruno Nardi, on the other hand, thinks Pomponazzi is in agreement with Achillini on this point: Il suo aristotelismo et il suo averroismo insomma non hanno la rigidità intransigente del pensiero dell'Achillini, con quale il mantovano era in sostanza d'accordo anche nel dubitare della dipendenza delle intelligenze a dei corpi celesti dalla causalità efficiente del primo motore. B. Nardi, "Appunti sull'averroista bolognese Alessandro Achillini", *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana,* Fas. I, (1954), 90.

[65] In aeternis et universaliter in omnibus abstractis a materia est dare unum efficiens producens ab aeterno sine vero motu et transmutatione, sed per simplicem emanationem. *Annotationes* . . . (Venice, 1505), fol. 176^{rb}.

Zimara also criticizes Jandun for holding that, according to the philosophers (*i.e.* Aristotle and Averroes), God is not the immediate efficient mover of the heaven (cf. *supra*, p. 191). *Op. cit.*, fol. 178^{rb}.

[66] Et hoc manifestat verum fuisse nostrum iudicium in iuventute nostra, ubi disputavimus in speciali quaestione de triplici causalitate intelligentiae, contra Gregorium Ariminensem et Joannem de Baccone, asseverantes in via Averrois corpora sempiterna non esse causata ab aeterno quo ad substantiam, sed quo ad motum tantum ab ipsa intelligentia. Et tunc iam non erat impressus tractatus iste, licet manifeste etiam pateat hoc idem ex 2 capitulo *De Substantia Orbis* (6M-7A), ubi Commentator expresse dicit se fecisse illam digressionem propter amorem veritatis, quia multi etiam suo tempore asserebant caelum non habere nisi causam moventem et non agentem . . . et Deus sit dator auxilii in tanta perpexitate et varietate doctorum. Zimara, *Tabula . . . in Dictis Aristotelis et Averrois* (Venice, 1576), fol. 14^{ra}. Cf. fol. 2^{ra}.

hesitation, pointing out that his classical Greek interpreters are not in agreement. But he is not doubtful at all that Averroes thought eternal beings are caused formally, finally and efficiently.[67]

Some of the most persuasive texts brought forth by Zimara to prove that Averroes thought eternal beings have a true efficient cause come from the Arabian philosopher's *Epitome of Metaphysics*, which was not translated into Latin until the sixteenth century, and hence was unknown to Jandun.[68] In one of these texts Averroes asserts that the metaphysician and the philosopher of nature consider causes in different ways. The metaphysician studies only formal and final causes and, in a certain way, agent causes. The latter type of cause does not mean the same to him as it does to the philosopher of nature; for in natural science an agent cause is a mover, preceding its effect in time and imparting to it nothing but movement, while in metaphysics the agent has no temporal priority over its effect, to which it gives its very form.[69]

Zimara points to this as a clear indication that Averroes distinguished between a natural and a metaphysical efficient cause, and that for him the eternal universe depends on God, not only as its form and end, but also as its true efficient cause.[70] He cites to the same purpose still another text of the *Epitome* in which Averroes asserts that the movers of the celestial bodies do not simply move them, but give them the forms by which they are what they are.[71]

On the strength of these and similar texts[72] Zimara opposes the interpretation of Jandun, Gregory of Rimini and Baconthorpe, that according to Averroes eternal beings cannot have a true efficient cause. In his marginal notes to Harvey of Nedellec's *Quodlibetal Questions*, he agrees with Harvey's opinion that Averroes thought eternal beings have an agent cause as well as a final cause.[73]

If we had his unedited treatise *De Triplici causalitate intelligentiae*, we could perhaps understand better in what sense Zimara understood Averroes' notion of a metaphysical agent cause. It appears from his extant writings, however, that he understood it in the sense of a true creator or giver of being, in the Avicennian sense of the term. It is precisely on this point that he parts company with Jandun, Gregory of Rimini and Baconthorpe. They understood well enough that Averroes spoke of an agent cause outside the order of time and movement, and that he admitted that eternal beings have, in a sense, an efficient cause. But they recognized that he always maintained that, in this sense, the term "agent" or "efficient cause" is used only metaphorically, and not properly. It is really identical with a formal or final cause.[74] Zimara does not point out that, in his *Epitome*, Averroes calls the movers of the celestial bodies "agents" only

---

[67] Cf. Zimara, *op. cit.*, fol. 2^{rab}.

[68] It was translated from the Hebrew by Jacob Mantinus. Cf. S. Van den Bergh, *Die Epitome der Metaphysik des Averroes* (Leiden, 1924), Vorwort.

[69] Hinc est quod haec scientia (*scil.* metaphysica) non praestat de causis, nisi formam et finem, et aliquo modo agens: videlicet non eo modo quo dicitur agens in rebus transmutabilibus, quia conditio agentis in hoc loco non est quod praecedat passum praecessione temporali, sicut fit in rebus naturalibus. . . . Nam arbitrari potest esse differentiam inter agens et movens, quia movens praestat mobili motum tantum, agens vero formam propter quam fit motus. Averroes, *Epitomes in libros Metaph.* 1, 356 I-K. S. Van den Bergh points out the unaristotelian character of this distinction, *op. cit.*, pp. 149-150.

[70] Cf. Zimara, *Tabula*, fol. 13^{vab}.

[71] Ex quo etiam ostenditur quod non sunt tantum motores corporum coelestium, immo dant eis formas suas, quibus sunt id quod sunt. Averroes, *op. cit.*, 4, 388 M. Cf. Zimara, *op. cit.*, fol. 13^{vb}.

[72] For instance: Nam agens est duplex. Aliquid enim est a quo provenit actum, in quo pendet operatio ejus hora, qua reperitur; et hoc, cum perficitur esse ejus, non indiget agente, ut esse domus ab aedificatore. Et aliquid est ex quo provenit actio tantum, quae pendet in acto; et non est esse huic acto nisi cum pendentia agentis in eo. Averroes, *Destructio Destructionum* 4; IX, 69C. Trans. by S. Van den Bergh, *Averroes' Tahafut al-Tahafut* I (London, 1954), p. 156. Cf. Zimara, *op. cit.*, fol. 13^{va}.

[73] Et ideo erubescant tenentes in via Aristotelis et Commentatoris entia aeterna habere causam finalem et non causam agentem, sicut nos late probavimus in quaestione nostra *De Triplice causalitate intelligentiae*. Zimara, Marginal Note to Harvey of Nedellec, *Quodl.* I, 8, fol. 18^{va}.

[74] Cf. *supra*, pp. 193, 194.

in a certain sense (*quoquo modo*),[75] and that the meaning of "agent" in this context becomes apparent when he declares that the form and end are sometimes called agents by a kind of similitude.[76] On this point, there is complete agreement between Averroes' *Epitome* and his other writings.

It seems justifiable to conclude that, on the subject of the divine causality, Jandun was a more faithful interpreter of Averroes than Zimara. Unlike Jandun, Zimara failed to recognize the revolutionary character of Avicenna's notion of true efficient causality as a source of being transcending time and movement, and the determined effort of Averroes to oppose this notion and to return to the doctrine of Aristotle. Gregory of Rimini, following Jandun, proved himself an excellent historian of philosophy when he summed up the situation, saying that the distinction between two kinds of production, one through motion and the other through the simple emanation of being, does not stem from Aristotle or Averroes, but from Avicenna, who in this matter greatly differed from them.[77]

APPENDIX

For the edition of the *Quaestio Disputata* of John of Jandun the following manuscripts have been used. *F, Ms* Florence, Bibl. Nazionale *Conv. Soppr.* I,

---

[75] Cf. Averroes, *Epitomes* 4, 393D.

[76] *Loc. cit.*, 388M-389A.

[77] Distinctio quoque quam dant de duplici factione, ut supra ostensum est, non est secundum doctrinam Philosophi aut Commentatoris, sed secundum Avicennam, qui ab eis in hoc plurimum discordat. Gregory of Rimini, *loc. cit.*, fol. 4^{rb}.

It is beyond our scope here to attempt to define Siger of Brabant's views on the divine causality. E. Gilson has pointed out the difficulty of this problem in his *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1955), pp. 391-392, 395. It is helpful, however, to compare John of Jandun's Question on this subject with Siger's: Utrum existentia semper possint habere causam efficientem et principium, loquendo secundum intentionem philosophorum. *Questions sur la Métaphysique*, II, 8, éd. C. Graiff (Louvain, 1948), p. 47.

Siger first gives arguments proving that eternal beings cannot have an efficient cause. We have already met them in John of Jandun's treatise. (1) It is the very nature of an agent or efficient principle to be the source of motion and of the effect. This implies, according to Aristotle, that there was a time prior to which the effect did not exist. Hence something eternal cannot be efficiently produced (lines 11-14). (2) Whatever has an agent or efficient cause can either be or not be. Now an eternal being does not have matter, which alone would make this possible. Hence an eternal being cannot either be or not be, and so it cannot have an agent cause (lines 15-31). (3) If the existence of anything has been caused, that thing will cease to exist if the extrinsic cause on which it depends is taken away. This is clear, for if the efficient cause of something's coming into being is removed, the coming into being also ceases, as light goes out when the sun ceases to cause it. And the same is true of the causes of the very being of things. Now eternal beings are such that they cannot cease to be, for of their very nature they lack potency to non-being. So they cannot have an efficient cause (lines 32-39).

These will be recognized as arguments used by Jandun to prove that, with the exception of motion, what is eternal cannot have a true efficient cause. But they are not convincing to Siger. In the first place, he does not think the notion of efficient cause should be limited to one which gives being through motion or change. Besides this type of efficient cause he recognizes another which gives being or becoming without change. And in this latter sense eternal beings can have an efficient cause: Sed advertendum est quod aliquid habere causam efficientem possumus intelligere dupliciter. Uno modo quod habeat causam efficientem per transmutationem ad esse, et tale non est sempiternum. Quod enim invenitur in fine transmutationis, non autem in principio, ipsum non fuit prius. Alio modo potest intelligi aliquid habere causam efficientem per hoc quod sit causa suae naturae et sui esse dans sibi esse, sic, quod non est causa esse vel fieri per transmutationem; et tale non tollit rationem effectus. Et sic possunt sempiterna habere causam sui esse (pp. 48-49, lines 51-61).

Secondly, Siger does not agree that whatever has an efficient cause can either be or not be. Whatever has a cause has being from its cause, but considered in itself that being is necessary (p. 50, lines 93-97). Siger here opposes Avicenna's conception of an eternal being as possible in itself and necessary by reason of its cause; and this is hardly to be wondered at, for he rejects the Avicennian metaphysics of being on which it is based. (Cf. E. Gilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 393-395).

What is not clear is the meaning of the second type of efficient cause mentioned above. Is it the Averroist or the Avicennian? Siger does not clearly say. In treating of the relation of God to the universe his sources are Neoplatonic rather than Averroist: Proclus, the *Liber de Causis* and Avicenna. (Cf. F. Van Steenberghen, *Siger de Brabant d'après ses oeuvres inédites* [Louvain, 1942], pp. 611-612; E. Gilson, *op. cit.*, p. 395). It is thus possible that he understood it in the Avicennian sense.

III, 6, fols. 122ʳ-123ʳ; *V*, *Ms* Vat. *lat.* 6768, fols. 230ᵛ-232ʳ; *O*, *Ms* Vat. *Ottob. lat.* 318, fols. 24ʳ-26ᵛ. *F* has been used as the base, and the variant readings of *V* have been given. *O* is either a different *reportatio* of the same Disputed Question, or an abbreviation made at a later date. The variants of this manuscript have not been given. Its readings have been used only a few times, when those of *F* and *V* are obviously incorrect. Both *F* and *V* seem to be in fourteenth-century Italian hands. According to the *explicit*, *O* was written by Raymond of Saleta November 28, 1493. Its margins contain the gloss of Anselm of Como, who taught at Bologna about 1335.[1] The gloss contains useful references to Aristotle and Averroes as well as summaries of the arguments in the Question.

UTRUM AETERNIS REPUGNET HABERE CAUSAM EFFICIENTEM

Quaeritur utrum aeternis repugnet habere causam efficientem.

[RATIONES PRINCIPALES]

<1> Et primo arguitur quod aeterna non possunt habere causam efficientem. Et ratio potest esse illa: Illud quod non potest non esse non habet causam efficientem. Sed aeterna non possunt non esse. Ergo, etc. *A* patet per Avicennam in VIII suae *Metaphysicae*.[2] *B* est nota in I *Caeli*,[3] ubi dicit quod illud quod est aeternum, semper est. Modo quod semper est, non potest non esse.

<2> Praeterea, illud quod, quolibet alio circumscripto, non potest corrumpi, non habet causam efficientem. Sed aeterna sunt hujusmodi. Quare, etc. *A* patet, nam si haberent causam efficientem, ipsa circumscripta, possent corrumpi; da enim quod remaneret, esset frustra postquam non haberet aliquam operationem. *B* patet, nam quolibet circumscripto, aeterna non possunt corrumpi. Nam sicut dicit Commentator,[4] decisio materiae ab aliqua re est causa perpetuitatis illius rei. Modo si aeterna non haberent aliquam materiam, non possunt corrumpi, cum materia sit principium corruptionis.

<3> Praeterea, illud quod non est factum non habet causam efficientem. Aeterna non sunt facta. Quare, etc. *A* patet, nam de ratione effectus respectu suae causae efficientis est quod habeat esse factum. *B* patet, nam omne quod est factum habet esse novum; sed nullum aeternum est novum, quia semper fuit.

<4> Praeterea, illud non habet causam efficientem quod non potest educi de potentia materiae. Aeterna[5] non possunt duci de potentia materiae. Quare,[6] etc. *A* patet, nam sicut dicit Philosophus in XII *Metaph.*,[7] verum agens non distinguit inter diversa, sed quod est in potentia reducit ad actum; ita quod illud quod habet causam efficientem debet reduci de potentia ad actum. *B* patet, nam si aeterna reducerentur de potentia ad actum, tunc dabitur tempus in quo aeternum non erit, et sic aeternum non esset, nam in aeternis non differt esse et posse. Et hoc est quia ibi primo non est potentia. Si sic, non possunt duci de potentia ad actum.

<5> Praeterea, illud quod non habet materiam non habet causam efficientem. Sed aeterna sunt hujusmodi. Quare, etc. *A* patet, quia materia est potentia passiva; sed causa efficiens est sicut causa[8] activa. Modo ubicumque est potentia activa, est passiva, cum referantur adinvicem, et si una non est, neque alia.[9] *B* patet, nam si haberent materiam, possent corrumpi. Nam I *Caeli et Mundi*[10] dicitur quod sicut acumen est passio cutelli, ita generatio et corruptio est (122ʳᵇ) passio materiae.

---

[1] On Anselm of Como, cf. A. Maier, *An der Grenze von Scholastik und Naturwissenschaft* (Essen, 1943), p. 139, note; *Die Vorläufer Galileis im 14. Jahrhundert* (Rome, 1949), pp. 261-262.

[2] Avicenna, *Metaph.* VIII, 3, fol. 98ᵛᵇ; 4, fols. 98ᵛᵇ-99ʳᵇ; cf. I, 7-8, fols. 73ʳ-74ʳ.

[3] Aristotle, *De Caelo* I, 12, 282a22-32.

[4] Averroes, *In II De Caelo*, t. c. 38, 122K.

[5] Aeternae *F*.

[6] *Om. F*.

[7] Averroes, *In XII Metaph.* t. c. 18, 304I.

[8] potentia *V*.

[9] neque alia: nec aliqua *V*.

[10] Averroes, *In I De Caelo*, t. c. 20, 15D.

IN CONTRARIUM videtur esse Aristoteles in II *Metaph.*,[11] ubi dicit quod oportet principia esse verissima, non quae quandoque[12] sunt et quandoque non, sed semper sunt; et non habent causam ut sint, sed ipsa aliis sunt causa. Super quo verbo videtur Commentator[13] asserere quod Deus sit causa esse omnium a se. Hoc idem ponit Philosophus in VI[14] et in prooemio libri *Metaph.*,[15] ubi dicit quod Deus tribuit esse omnibus entibus. Hoc etiam videtur esse de mente Philosophi[16] I *Caeli*,[17] ubi dicit quod a primo principio omnibus communicatum est esse et vivere; his quidem clarius, his vero obscurius.

Hoc idem potest argui ratione. Quia motus corporis supercaelestis est aeternus. Sed motus corporis supercaelestis habet causam efficientem. Ergo aeterna possunt habere causam efficientem. *B* patet in VIII *Physicorum*[18] et in XII *Metaph.*[19] Quod autem ipse habeat[20] causam efficientem patet, nam dependet ex duobus: ex uno sicut ex causa materiali, ut ex corpore ipso mobili; ex motore autem sicut ex causa efficienti.

Praeterea, omne quod habet materiam partem sui, quae est in potentia ad esse simpliciter, habet causam efficientem. Sed aeterna, vel aliquod aeternum, est hujusmodi. Quare, etc. *A* patet, nam materia, quae est in potentia ad esse simpliciter, est pars substantiae et eget agente[21] reducente ipsam ad actum. *B* patet; Commentator enim[22] in III *De Anima*[23] dicit quod anima intellectiva est quaedam substantia aeterna; tamen habet intellectum possibilem aliquam partem sui, cum[24] ita sit quod intellectus possibilis sit pura potentia in genere intelligibilium, sicut materia prima est pura potentia in genere sensibilium.

Praeterea, omne quod habet aliquam passionem qua potest carere, habet causam efficientem. Sed aliquod aeternum est hujusmodi. Quare, etc. *A* patet, nam si non haberet causam efficientem, posset corrumpi. Da enim quod remaneat, erit frustra, quia non habebit passionem. *B* patet, nam corpus supercaeleste habet illam passionem, scilicet motum. Modo motus potest corrumpi, quia per se habet contrarium, ut quietem.

Praeterea, omne habens propriam passionem quae habet causam efficientem, et ipsum habet causam efficientem. Sed aliquod aeternum est hujusmodi. Quare, etc. *A* patet in quarto[25] *Caeli*: dans formam, dat omnia consequentia ad formam. *B* patet, nam motus habet causam efficientem. Unde dicit Philosophus in VIII *Physicorum*[26] quod nihil[27] prohibet quorundam aeternorum esse causam efficientem. Et super isto verbo dicit Commentator[28] quod si pes fuisset ab aeterno, cum etiam fixio pedis in pulvere fuisset ab aeterno, et tamen fixio pedis procedit a pede tamquam a causa efficiente, videtur igitur quod aeterna habeant causam efficientem.

His visis, respondendum est ad quaestionem. Ad cujus evidentiam est sciendum quod de illa quaestione fuerunt tres opiniones. Prima fuit opinio Avicennae et Algazelis,[29] dicentis omnium aeternorum a primo esse causam efficientem. Secunda fuit opinio alia, tenens ipsorum ex toto[30] non[31] esse causam efficientem. Sed tertia opinio est tenens viam mediam.

---

[11] Aristotle, *Metaph.* II, 1, 993b28-31. *Om. Metaph. V.*

[12] quandocumque *F.*

[13] Averroes, *In II Metaph.* t. c. 4, 30C.

[14] Aristotle, *Metaph.* VI, 1, 1026a17.

[15] *Op. cit.*, I, 2, 983a8.

[16] *Add.* in *V.*

[17] Aristotle, *De Caelo* I, 9, 279a30.

[18] Aristotle, *Physics* VIII, 6, 258b10-259a8.

[19] Aristotle, *Metaph.* XII, 7, 1072a21-25.

[20] habet *V.*

[21] agere *F.*

[22] *Om. V.*

[23] Averroes, *In III De Anima*, t. c. 4-5, 137^{v}-139^{v}.

[24] *Add.* igitur *V.*

[25] octavo *V.* Cf. Averroes, *In III De Caelo*, t. c. 28, 198E.

[26] Aristotle, *Physics* VIII, 6, 259a7-8; 260a1. Cf. Averroes, *In VIII Phys.*, t. c. 48, 389A-C.

[27] motus *FV.*

[28] Non inveni. Cf. St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei* X, 31; PL 41, 311.

[29] Avicenna, *Metaph.* I, 7-8, fols. 73^{r}-74^{r}; XI, 1, fols. 101^{v}-102^{r}. *Sufficientia* I, 2, fol. 14va. Algazel, *Metaph.* I, 2, 12; ed. J. T. Muckle (Toronto, 1933), pp. 58-61; I, 1, 8, p. 47.

[30] mixto *FV.*

[31] modo *V.*

[RATIONES]

<1> Ad primam opinionem sic arguitur de mente Avicennae.[32] Omnis illa causa quae habet esse causa sufficiens, ipsa posita ab aeterno non impedita, et suus effectus ponetur ab aeterno. Sed Deus est hujusmodi. Quare, etc. *A* patet; da enim quod non poneretur effectus, non esset causa sufficiens. *B* patet. Primo enim Deus est causa sufficiens, immo sufficientissima, quia nullus defectus in ipso reperitur, et non habet impedimentum, et etiam ponitur ab aeterno, ut notum est. Ergo relinquitur quod suus effectus ponatur ab aeterno, et sic videtur quod aeterna habeant causam efficientem.

<2> Item, in omni genere est devenire ad unum primum, ut patet in VII *Metaph.*[33] Modo si aeternorum non esset causa efficiens, tunc in motoribus non deveniremus ad unum primum. Ergo, etc. *A* videtur esse nota, sed *B* probatur. Nam da quod aeterna non habeant causam efficientem, illud primum ad quod deveniretur maxime erunt corpora supercaelestia. Sed talia non possunt esse, quia illud quod est primum in aliquo genere debet esse simplex; sed talia sunt composita. Quare, etc. *A* patet. *B* probatur, quia secundum sententiam theologorum,[34] componuntur ex materia et forma; secundum autem sententiam philosophorum,[35] componuntur ex subjecto et accidente, et motore et mobili. Modo cum ibi sint duo, sunt multi; et per consequens adhuc illa multa oportet quod reducantur ad aliquod principium,[36] ita quod in eis non erit status; et per consequens deveniretur ad primum principium tamquam ad causam primam in genere causae efficientis. Ergo videtur quod aeterna habeant causam efficientem.

<3> Praeterea, quae dependent in esse ab aliquo, habent causam efficientem. Sed aeterna alia a Deo sunt hujusmodi. Quare, etc. *A* patet, nam sicut[37] primum dependere est a causa efficiente, sic primum dependere a fine est dependere in agere. *B* patet in III *Metaph.*,[38] ubi dicitur quod Deus est propter quem omnia sunt et fiunt.

<4> Praeterea, in aeternis idem est efficiens et finis. Sed Deus est causa finalis omnium a se; ergo etiam erit efficiens.

<5> Praeterea, si hoc non esset, sequitur quod in aliqua multitudine non daretur unum primum; et deducatur sicut prius, quia parum illa ratio differt ab illa.

<6> Praeterea, arguitur ratione quam tenentes istam partem reputant demonstrationem et achillem. Et est illa: Omne quod per se habet causam finalem, oportet quod habeat aliquam causam efficientem. Sed omnia a Deo sunt hujusmodi. Quare, etc. *A* patet, nam omne quod reductum[39] in se, in nihil revertitur, oportet quod habeat aliquam causam efficientem deducentem de non esse ad esse. Sed omne quod per se dependet in aliquo genere causae, in se reducitur vel revertitur, et absolutum ab illa causa a qua per se dependet, et revertitur in nihil, ut notum est; ut si omnia aeterna absolverentur a Deo tamquam a fine, in se reducta, reverterentur in nihil. Quare, etc.

[AUCTORITATES]

Hoc etiam ipsi nituntur probare de ratione de mente Commentatoris et Philosophi. Et primo auctoritate Philosophi in prooemia *Metaph.*,[40] ubi dicitur quod Deus solus est sicut causa; et in II,[41] oportet principia semper esse verissima, quae non aliquando sunt et aliquando non sunt, sed semper; quae non habent causam, sed aliis sunt causa.

---

[32] Avicenna, *Metaph.* IX, 4, fol. 104^{v}.

[33] Cf. Aristotle, *Metaph.* II, 2, 994a1-19. *Om. Metaph. V.*

[34] Cf. St. Thomas, *In I De Caelo et Mundo* 6; ed. Leon. III (Rome, 1886), p. 24, n. 6.

[35] Cf. Averroes, *De Substantia Orbis* 2, 6H-I; 6, 11E-13G; *In I De Caelo*, t. c. 20, 15CD; *In VIII Metaph.* t. c. 12, 220GH.

[36] primum *V.*

[37] *Om. V.*

[38] Aristotle, *Metaph.* III, 2, 996a22-29.

[39] revertitur *V.*

[40] *Op. cit.* I, 2, 983a8. *Om. Metaph. V.* Aristotle here says that God is thought to be *among* the causes of all things.

[41] *Op. cit.*, II, 1, 993b28-31.

Hoc idem patet per Philosophum in VI,[42] ubi dicit quod causae superiores sunt aeternae. Et Commentator[43] dicit quod causa prima magis est digna dici[44] aeterna quam aliqua alia causa quia est causa aliis ut sint.[45]

Hoc idem videtur esse de mente Commentatoris in XII,[46] ubi dicit[47] contra Avicennam quod causa propter quam Aristoteles fuit motus ad ponendum etiam immaterialia fuit factio intelligibilium; quasi velit dicere quod, sicut ad factionem materialium requiruntur entia materialia, eodem modo ad factionem entium immaterialium oportet quod requirantur entia immaterialia.

Hoc idem dicit in eodem XII,[48] ubi Commentator dicit quod Deus est causa in triplici genere causae, finalis, efficientis, et formalis.[49] Hoc dicit in VII[50] contra Avicennam, qui ponebat[51] quod Deus solum[52] comparatur ut finis ad substantiam primam sensibilem. Sed dicit Commentator[53] quod etiam comparatur ut agens. Et constat quod Commentator non intellexit per finem et agens idem; sic enim committet[54] nugationem, et etiam sua (122^{va}) improbatio nihil valet.

Hoc etiam[55] patet per Commentatorem in XII,[56] ubi dicit quod factio illorum inferiorum est factio superficialis; sed factio superiorum est vera; et per consequens ibi est verum[57] agens.

Hoc etiam videtur esse de mente Commentatoris in suo tractatu *De Substantia orbis*,[58] ubi Commentator dicit quod non solum prima causa est causa continuitatis motus, sed est etiam causa substantiae motae.

Hoc etiam dicit Commentator,[59] quod non solum corpora supercaelestia egent aliqua virtute largiente eis motum, sed etiam egent aliqua virtute largiente eis perpetuitatem substantiae.

Hoc etiam ipse dicit[60] ulterius, ubi dicit[61] quod prima causa non solum est causa efficiens aliorum, sed etiam agens. Et sic ipse subdit[62] quamdam distinctionem cum dicit quod aliquod dicitur prius altero dupliciter: uno modo secundum tempus, alio modo secundum naturam. Modo ipsa causa prima est prior aliis aeternis secundum naturam, sed non secundum tempus. Et propter ignorantiam istius distinctionis aliqui ignoraverunt ipsum universum habere causam efficientem, nam habet. Sic ergo patet quod aeterna habent causam efficientem, ut satis visum fuit, et[63] patuit ex praedictis commenti et Philosophi.[64]

Sed videte, illa opinio non est vera, scilicet quod aeterna universaliter habent causam efficientem. Et ratio hujus est, quia si aeterna universaliter haberent causam efficientem, aut hoc esset per motum et transmutationem, aut per simplicem emanationem sive creationem. Non primo modo, quia in tali productione oportet quod supponatur materia. Sed intelligentiae, quae sunt puri actus, nullam habent materiam. Nec per simplicem creationem, quia[65] in simplici creatione nihil supponitur, ita, scilicet, quod ex nihilo possit aliquid fieri. Sed hoc est contra intentionem Philosophi.[66]

Item, illud quod non potest non esse, non habet aliquam causam efficientem. Sed aeterna, saltem aliqua, non possunt non esse. Ergo non habent causam efficientem. *A* patet per Avicennam, qui ponit quod habens causam efficientem, habet potentiam ad esse et non esse.[67] *B* patet, quia da quod possunt[68] non esse, ponentur in esse, nam possibili posito in esse, nullum sequitur impossibile. Sit ergo *b* illud tempus in quo ponuntur non esse; sed cum ex alia parte ipsa aeterna semper sunt, ergo implicabuntur contradictoria, quia semper erunt et non semper erunt.

---

[42] *Op. cit.*, VI, 1, 1026a17.

[43] Averroes, *In VI Metaph.* t. c. 2, 146G.

[44] digna dici: dignus de *V*.

[45] sunt *F*.

[46] Averroes, *In VII Metaph.* t. c. 31, 181K.

[47] dicitur *V*.

[48] *Op. cit.*, XII, t. c. 38, 321FG.

[49] materialis *FV*.

[50] *Op. cit.*, VII, t. c. 31, 181I-K.

[51] Avicenna, *Metaph.* IX, 4, fol. 104^{vab}.

[52] solus *V*.

[53] Averroes, *In XII Metaph.* t. c. 38, 321FG.

[54] committetur *FV*.

[55] Hoc etiam: Item hoc *V*.

[56] Averroes, *In XII Metaph.* t. c. 44, 328D.

[57] unum *FV*.

[58] Averroes, *De Sub. Orbis* 4, 10I; cf. 2, 6I.

[59] *Op. cit.*, 2, fol. 6I.

[60] *Om. V*.

[61] *Ibid.*, 6L.

[62] *Ibid.*, 6M-7A.

[63] *Add.* hora *V*.

[64] Cf. *supra*, note 26.

[65] sed *FV*.

[66] Aristotle, *Physics* I, 4, 187a29.

[67] Cf. *supra*, note 2.

[68] possint *V*.

Item, hoc est contra intentionem Philosophi[69] VIII *Metaph.*,[70] qui ponens differentiam inter causam formalem et efficientem, dicit quod causa efficiens est causa in fieri et transmutari, sed forma est causa in esse tantum. Tunc arguitur: Illud non habet causam efficientem quod non subjicitur motui et transmutationi. Sed ipsa aeterna, saltem aliqua, non possunt subjici motui nec[71] transmutationi. Ergo non habent causam efficientem. *A* patet per Philosophum.[72] *B* etiam patet, nam puri actus non possunt subjici motui nec transmutationi, sicut intelligentiae; sic enim participarent materia; quod est falsum.

Item, hoc est contra intentionem Philosophi in eodem libro *Metaph.*,[73] ubi ponens differentiam[74] inter causam formalem et efficientem, dicit quod causa efficiens est prior suo effectu, sed causa formalis simul est cum suo effectu. Modo manifestum est quod ipse non loquitur de prioritate naturae, quia[75] causa formalis est prior prioritate naturae, sed loquitur de prioritate temporis. Ergo si aeterna haberent causam efficientem, jam causa illa tempore praecessisset et in aliquo tempore aeterna non fuissent; quod est falsum ex eo quod semper sunt.

Hoc etiam videtur esse contra intentionem Commentatoris in XII,[76] qui ponit quod in superioribus non est aliquis proventus,[77] neque aliqua actio; et sic ibi non est agens.

Hoc etiam videtur esse contra intentionem Commentatoris IV *Caeli*[78] circa principium, ubi Commentator dicit quod in superioribus, scilicet intelligentiis, non reperitur nisi causa formalis et finalis; sed efficiens proprie non reperitur nisi secundum similitudinem.

Advertendum tamen quod causa efficiens est duplex, scilicet proprie dicta; et ista solum reperitur in istis. Sed alia est causa efficiens improprie dicta; et ista talis causa poterit appellari causa finalis et formalis. Quod est de mente Philosophi in I *De Generatione*,[79] qui ponit quod sanitas est causa efficiens secundum metaphoram tantum, et tamen est causa finalis sive formalis. Et illo modo Deus erit causa finalis, nam Deus est totius naturae bonum; bonum autem proprie reperitur in causa finali.

Et Tunc ad Rationes

<Ad 1> Ad primam, cum dicitur, "Illa causa quae est sufficiens, ipsa posita ab aeterno, et effectus ponitur ab aeterno", aliqui concedunt istam. Et cum dicitur in *B*, "Deus est talis", negatur, nam Deus per se non est suppositus, sed oportet quod supponitur[80] materia. Sed ista solutio non videtur ex toto sufficiens, cum ita sit quod in Deo nullum malum et nulla privatio reperiatur. Et ideo solvo aliter, concedendo majorem. Et cum dicitur in minori quod Deus est causa omnium, etc., dico quod est causa finalis, sed non est causa efficiens nisi improprie et secundum quamdam similitudinem.

<Ad 2> Ad aliam, cum dicitur, "Si Deus non esset causa efficiens,[81] tunc in motoribus non deveniretur ad primum", dico quod non sequitur. Et cum probatur, quia si aeterna non haberent causam efficientem, tunc illud ad quod devenitur erit corpus supercaeleste, conceditur. Et cum dicitur non, quia omne habens rationem primi debet esse simplex, dico quod erit devenire ad ipsam intelligentiam quae est causa efficiens motus caeli, quae secundum se est simplex, et

---

[69] *Add.* in *V.*

[70] Aristotle, *Metaph.* VIII, 3, 1043a29-1043b14; 4, 1044a33-1044b20; 6, 1045a20-33.

[71] et *V.*

[72] Aristotle, *Physics* II, 3, 194b29-31; 195a5-8, 22; *De Gen. et Corr.* I, 7, 324b14; *Metaph.* V, 2, 1013a29-33.

[73] Cf. *supra*, note 70; also Aristotle, *Metaph.* XII, 3, 1070a22.

[74] *Add.* Philosophus *V.*

[75] *Add.* in *FV.*

[76] Averroes, *In XII Metaph.* t. c. 44, 327I.

[77] punctus *FOV.*

[78] Averroes, *In IV De Caelo*, t. c. 1, 234A.

[79] Aristotle, *De Gen. et Corr.* I, 8, 324b14-18.

[80] supponatur *V.*

[81] *Add.* nisi improprie et secundum quamdam similitudinem *V.*

maxime erit devenire ad ultimam intelligentiam moventem ultimum orbem; et talis non habet aliquam compositionem.

<Ad 3> Ad aliam, cum dicitur, "Illa quae dependent ab alio in esse habent causam efficientem", dico quod illa propositio est falsa. Nam non solum efficiens est causa alicujus in esse, sed materia et finis. Et sic Deus, inquantum habet rationem causae finalis, erit causa in esse. Unde Philosophus in III *Metaph.*,[82] definiens causam finalem, dicit quod finis est ille propter quem omnia sunt et fiunt.

<Ad 4> Ad aliam, cum dicitur, "In aeternis idem est efficiens et finis", dico quod in aeternis illud quod est efficiens alicujus est finis illius, sicut intelligentia est causa caeli moti; eo quod movet, est causa efficiens. Modo ipsa intelligentia est finis, nam sicut dicit Commentator,[83] intelligentia movet per se.

<Ad 5> Ad aliam, cum dicitur, "Tunc non esset devenire ad unum primum", dico quod immo. Et cum postea dicitur, etc., dico quod non concludit ratio quod deveniatur ad unum tamquam ad primum in ratione causae efficientis, sed bene devenitur ad ipsum tamquam ad primum in ratione causae finalis.

<Ad 6> Ad aliam, cum dicitur, "Illa quae per se habent causam finalem oportet quod habeant[84] causam efficientem," dico quod illa propositio est falsa. Et cum dicitur quia quod est tale, reductum in se, reducitur in nihil; sed omne tale quod convertitur in nihil oportet quod habeat aliquam causam efficientem deducentem ipsum de potentia ad actum, dico quod "aliquid converti in nihil, in se reductum," potest intelligi duobus modis: uno modo quod, quia suum esse sit[85] ad aliud ordinatum; quo proposito, ipsum ponitur, et quo remoto, ipsum removetur. Et tale quod in se convertitur in nihil non habet causam efficientem, vel non est necessarium quod habeat. Alio modo quia[86] convertitur in non ens, quia sit non in actu ens, tamen in potentia. Et illo modo bene oportet quod habeat causam efficientem, nam cuicumque potentiae passivae oportet quod correspondeat potentia activa. Et hoc est quod Commentator dicebat,[87] quod verum agens non congregat inter diversa, sed quod est in potentia reducit ad actum.

AD AUCTORITATES

Primo Philosophi: Ubi Philosophus loqui de causa simplici, vel intellexit de (122^{vb}) causa finali, vel de causa efficienti improprie vel per similitudinem, quae eadem est quod causa finalis. Et hoc quando loquitur de Deo.

Tunc ad auctoritates Commentatoris. Ad primam, quando dicitur quod Commentator,[88] loquens contra Avicennam, dicit quod illud quod movit Philosophum ad ponendum substantias immateriales fuit factio intelligibilium, dicendum quod Commentator intellexit per hunc modum. Ad cujus evidentiam est sciendum quod Avicenna in sua *Metaphysica*[89] posuit quamdam decimam intelligentiam quae habet introducere formas sensibiles et materiam sensibilem, et formas intelligibiles et[90] intellectum ipsum. Sed primo Commentator respondit aliquod.[91] Et dicit Commentator quod hoc non est possibile, nam quod aliquod habeat introducere in materiam sensibilem oportet quod transmutet materiam. Sed omne transmutans materiam est agens corporale. Sed illa ultima intelligentia non est agens corporale. Ergo non habet introducere formas sensibiles in materiam. Et postea subdit Commentator,[92] loquens de formis intelligibilibus, idest de speciebus rerum intelligibilium, dicit quod illud quod movit Aristotelem ad ponendum aliquam substantiam immaterialem, quia intellectum agentem, fuit factio rerum intelligibilium.

---

[82] Aristotle, *Metaph.* III, 2, 996a22-26; cf. II, 2, 994b9.

[83] Averroes, *In XII Metaph.* t. c. 52, 337H-338B.

[84] habent *V.*

[85] *Om. FV.*

[86] quod *V.*

[87] *Op. cit.*, XII, t. c. 18, 304I.

[88] *Op. cit.*, VII, t. c. 31, 181K.

[89] Avicenna, *Metaph.* IX, 3, fol. 104^{rb}

[90] *Om. V.*

[91] Averroes, *In VII Metaph.* t. c. 31, 181K. aliquod: cum Deo *F.*

[92] *Ibid.*

Ad aliam auctoritatem, quae dicit quod in aeternis non est aliquis proventus nec aliqua, etc., sicut in istis quae actiones sunt superficietenus et non vere agentium: Et aliqui sic exponunt quod in superioribus non est proventus nec actio. Sed in istis sic, quia actiones istae sunt actiones superficietenus, idest, sunt actiones factae per qualitates superficietenus quia sunt in superficie, ex eo quod non sunt qualitates sive actiones agentium vere, quia verum agens reperitur in superioribus. Sed istum intellectum Commentator non habuit; immo intellexit sic, quod actiones aliquae in istis inferioribus non vere sunt agentium superficietenus; actiones illae quae fiunt non propter formam substantialem introducendam in materiam, sed magis sunt alterationes quaedam, non verae actiones; non proprie illa vocatur actio quae fit propter formam substantialem introduci in materiam. Et tales actiones, quae vocantur alterationes, sunt actiones agentium superficietenus; non sunt introducentes nisi quasdam dispositiones.

Ad aliam, cum dicit Commentator quod non solum caelum requirit aliquid quod sit causa motus, sed aliquid perpetuitatis caeli in esse, voluit sic intelligere quod non solum corpus supercaeleste requirit intelligentiam, quae est causa effectiva sui motus, sed Deus, licet sit causa continuationis per comparationem quam habet intelligentia ad eum tamquam ad finem, sed etiam requirit aliquid ad quod suum esse sit ordinativum, quo perpetuato, et ipsum perpetuetur. Non propterea volebat se referre ad causam efficientem veram; sed volebat se referre ad causam finalem, quod idem est quod causa efficiens secundum metaphoram.

Et ideo dicit quod causa est duplex: quaedam est quae est prior secundum tempus, sicut vera causa transmutans; et[93] quaedam est causa quae est prior secundum naturam, sicut causa efficiens improprie, quae idem est quod causa finalis. Et ideo dicit quod ignorantes talem distinctionem ignoraverunt universum habere talem causam, nam universus habet illo modo causam efficientem improprie, quia causam finalem, sicut primum principium.

* * *

His visis, recitanda est opinio aliorum. Et sunt quidam dicentes, credentes loqui secundum sententiam Commentatoris, quod breviter nullum aeternum habet causam efficientem. Et ratio hujus est quia omne habens causam efficientem est in potentia. Sed omne ens in potentia materiam habet. Sed aeterna non habent materiam. Ergo non habent causam efficientem, quia non sunt in potentia. *A* patet de se. *B*[94] etiam patet, quia secundum Commentatorem in III *Caeli*,[95] abscisio materiae a rebus est causa perpetuitatis illarum.

Sed illa positio non valet. Primo quidem de mente Commentatoris in XII *Metaph.*,[96] ubi Philosophus dicit quod prima causa comparatur ad substantiam motam in triplici genere causae: efficiens, formalis, et finalis. Et hoc patet ad sensum, scilicet, quod motus habet causam efficientem; et tamen motus est aliquid aeternum. Et hoc videtur esse de mente Commentatoris in tractatu *De Substantia orbis*,[97] ubi ponit[98] quod intelligentia est causa substantiae primae sensibilis ut finis et ut motor. Sed constat quod per motorem non intellexit finem; sic enim ibi est inutilis repetitio verborum. Ergo per motorem Commentator intellexit causam efficientem.

* * *

Propter quod sunt alii aliter dicentes; et dicunt quod aeterna sunt duplicia: quaedam sunt quae sunt de genere substantiae, et quaedam quae sunt de genere accidentis. Modo dicunt quod aeterna de genere substantiae non habent causam efficientem. Et ratio est, nam illud non habet causam efficientem quod non potest non esse. Sed talia sunt hujusmodi. Quare, etc. *A* patet per Avicennam.[99] *B* etiam, quod potuit non esse, ponatur in esse. Possibili enim posito in esse, nullum sequitur impossibile. Et tunc ratio deducatur sicut prius.

---

[93] *Om. V.*

[94] Minor *V.*

[95] Cf. Averroes, *In II De Caelo*, t. c. 38, 122K.

[96] Averroes, *In XII Metaph.* t. c. 36, 318F-K, 321FG. Cf. Aristotle, *Metaph.* XII, 7, 1072b8-14.

[97] Averroes, *De Sub. Orbis* 2, 6M.

[98] *Add.* Commentator *V.*

[99] Avicenna, *Metaph.* VIII, 3, fol. 98^{vb}; 4, fols. 98^{vb}-99^{rb}.

Item, illud quod non habet materiam non potest habere causam efficientem. Sed aeterna sunt hujusmodi. Quare, etc., scilicet substantiae. *A* patet, quia causa efficiens est causa in fieri et transmutari. Sed illud transmutari recipitur in aliquo; sed in nullo recipitur nisi mediante materia. *B* patet de se. Si enim haberent materiam, essent jam corporalia. Constat autem quod non sunt corporalia.

Item, si aeterna haberent causam efficientem, tunc sequitur quod natura possibilis converteretur in naturam aeternam; hoc autem est falsum. Consequentia statim patet, nam manifestum est quod si habent materiam, ipsa sunt possibilia. Sed si sunt possibilia, cum ex alia parte dicas ipsa esse aeterna, ergo natura possibilis transiret in naturam aeternam; hoc autem falsum est. Neque valet[1] si dicatur quod ratio non concludit, nam dato quod ipsa aeterna habeant causam efficientem, tamen seipsis habent esse formaliter, sicut albedo existens in corpore seipsa habet esse formaliter, et tamen habet causam efficientem. Nec ratio valet aliquid, quia illam rationem Commentator[2] facit contra Avicennam, qui ponebat[3] quod corpora supercaelestia habebant materiam; sed ego ponam quod talia non habeant materiam.

Ista solutio adhuc stare non potest. Primo quidem quia omne quod habet causam efficientem totum suum esse habet ab illa[4] causa. Si ergo totum suum esse habet a causa illa, ergo prius fuit in potentia quam in actu esset. Da enim quod ipsa semper in actu essent, non esset necessarium quod ipsa haberent causam efficientem. Modo talia per te habent causam efficientem. Ergo primo fuerunt in potentia quam in actu. Si ergo primo fuerunt in potentia quam in actu, ergo fuit dare aliquod tempus in quo ipsa non fuerunt; et sic non erunt aeterna, cum aeterna semper sunt.

Sed etiam isti possunt reprehendi de insufficientia, quemadmodum et ipsi reprehendunt alios. Nam non credo quod quaecumque accidentia habent causam efficientem, nam accidentia sunt duplicia, scilicet permanentia, sicut quantitas caeli, et etiam sua lux; et talia non habent causam efficientem. Et substantia (123ra) caeli non habet causam efficientem. Et non intelligo per ipsam lucem illuminationem factam in aere et in terra, quia talis bene est corporalis et generabilis, nam lux habet causari per radios lineae directae. Ergo si habet causari per radios lineae directae, cum caelum continue revolvatur, ergo istae lineae facientes punctum continue corrumpentur et generabuntur. Sed intelligo per lucem ipsam substantiam lucis. Sed aliqua sunt accidentia successiva, sicut motus, et hujusmodi talia; et ista bene habent causam efficientem.

[DUBITATIONES]

His visis, restat movere dubitationes quasdam. Et quia dicta sunt duo in quaestione, ideo contra haec duo arguam.

<1> Et primo contra primum, ubi dicebatur quod substantia aeterna non habet causam efficientem: contra, quia aut[5] hoc repugnaret sibi ex parte substantiae in eo quod substantiae, aut ex parte aeternitatis; neque sic, neque sic. Ergo nullo modo. *A* patet per sufficientem divisionem. *B* patet primo: Non potest repugnare ex parte substantiae in eo quod substantiae, quia tunc repugnaret omni substantiae; quod est falsum; neque ex parte aeternitatis, quia tunc repugnaret omni enti aeterno; quod est falsum. Ergo relinquitur quod substantia habeat causam efficientem; et dato quod sit aeterna.

<2> Secundo, quia dicebatur quod aliqua accidentia aeterna habebant causam efficientem, arguitur contra; et facio illasmet rationes quas faciebas de substantia.

---

[1] *Add.* quod *V.*

[2] Averroes, *In VIII Phys.* t. c. 79, 426K-427A; cf. *In XII Metaph.* t. c. 10, 297A.

[3] Avicenna, *Metaph.* IX, 4, fols. 104^{r}-105^{r}.

[4] alia *V.*

[5] *Om. F.*

Et hoc sic: Omne habens causam efficientem potest non esse. Sed nullum aeternum potest non esse. Ergo nullum aeternum habet causam efficientem. *A* patet, et concessa est; et *B* etiam, nam da quod possunt[6] non esse, ponatur in esse; quia possibili posito in esse, nullum sequitur impossibile. Et sic etiam sequitur[7] sicut deductum fuit prius, quia causabitur tempus quo aliquod aeternum non erit; quod est falsum.

<3> Item, omne quod habet causam efficientem habet esse post non esse, tamenque aeterna non habent esse post non esse.[8] Ergo non habent causam efficientem. *A* patet de se; *B* etiam. Si enim haberent esse post non esse, jam esset dare tempus in quo non essent; quod est falsum.

Ad Illa Breviter

<Ad 1> Ad primam, cum dicitur, "aut hoc repugnaret, etc.," dico quod non repugnat ex parte substantiae tantum, neque ex parte aeternitatis, sed ex parte substantiae aeternae. Sed tu dices: Illud nihil est, quia quod inest alicui ratione ambarum partium inest sibi ratione totius. Si igitur non repugnat substantiae aeternae habere causam efficientem ratione utriusque partis, nec etiam repugnabit sibi ex parte totius. Dico quod ista ratio imaginatur quod substantia aeterna sit quoddam compositum ex[9] aeternitate et substantia tamquam ex duabus naturis per se distinctis; sed hoc est falsum. Aeternum enim et substantia unam praecise dicunt essentiam; quia secundum quod dicit Commentator in X,[10] si necessarium, possibile et contingens sunt de substantia rerum in quibus sunt, et si necessarium est de substantia rerum, eodem modo et aeternum, cum aeternum sit necessarium.

<Ad 2> Ad aliam, cum dicitur, "Quod habet causam efficientem potest non esse", verum est in accidente. Et cum dicitur quod accidentia talia habent causam efficientem, conceditur. Ergo bene potuerunt non esse quaedam ex parte eorum; sed si non possunt non esse, hoc est quia de se proprie non habent esse, sed esse quod habent, habent ex substantia. Et quia substantia talis est impossibilis non esse, ideo et etiam accidentia. Et propterea dicit Commentator in XII *Metaph.*,[11] in illa digressione *Johannes autem Grammaticus*, quod in hoc differt substantia ab accidente; nam substantia est potens esse per aliquod quod est pars sui, sed accidentia non habent aliquid quod sit pars sui per quod sunt[12] possibilia esse. Et ideo si non sunt possibilia esse per aliquid suum, sed in virtute substantiae, hinc est quod, dato quod accidentia, quantum est ex parte ipsorum, possunt non esse, tamen non possunt non esse propter substantiam in qua sunt. Postea dicebatur:[13] "Ponatur in esse" dicitur quod proprie non debent poni in esse; nam sicut dictum est, accidentia habent esse ex substantia et sequuntur substantiam. Et ideo non possunt proprie poni in esse.

Et propterea illa regula: Possibili posito in esse, nullum sequitur impossibile, habet veritatem de proprio possibili. Et ideo bene volo quod motus, quantum est de se, possit corrumpi quia habet contrarium, scilicet quietem, ex eo quod sunt opposita privative.

Sed tu dices: Illud non valet, quia si motus et quies sunt privative opposita, jam caelum quiescit, quia cum opposita privative habeant fieri circa idem, ergo caelum erit in potentia ad suscipiendum utrumque oppositorum. Da enim quod non esset dare aliquam potentiam quae non reduceretur ad actum, et per consequens esset frustra, dicendum quod potentia est duplex, quia quaedam est potentia quae respicit actum positivum, sicut potentia materiae respicit formam quae debet introduci, et non potest introduci nisi per corruptionem alicujus formae praecedentis. Talis potentia frustra esset nisi reduceretur ad actum. Sed alia est potentia quae non respicit aliquid nisi privative, sicut nos dicimus modo quod caelum est in potentia ad quietem privative, ex eo quod nunquam quiescet, quia ab aeterno fuit motus et nunquam quiescet, sed aeternaliter movebitur.

---

[6] possint *V*.

[7] sequetur *V*.

[8] *Om.* tamenque . . . esse *F*.

[9] *Om.* *F*.

[10] Averroes, *In X Metaph.* t. c. 26, 276LM.

[11] Averroes, *In XII Metaph.* t. c. 41, 324B-M.

[12] sint *V*.

[13] *Om.* *FV*.

<Ad 3> Ad aliam, cum dicitur, "Habens causam efficientem habet esse post non esse", conceditur. Et cum dicitur, "Accidentia talia sunt hujusmodi", dico quod accidentia sunt duplicia, scilicet permanentia et successiva. Et ista duo differunt, quia accidentia permanentia ad eorum esse requirunt omnes partes suas simul et in actu. Sed accidentia successiva non requirunt omnes partes in actu, sed aliquas in actu et aliquas in potentia, ita quod sint in continuo fieri. Et tunc immediate patet solutio. Nam accidentia illa successiva habent esse post non esse quo ad partem ipsorum, non autem quo ad totum.

Sed tu dices: "Nonne illa secundum se tota habent causam efficientem?" Dico quod illo modo secundum se tota habent causam, quia non est aliqua pars in toto motu quae non possit habere causam efficientem. Sed non debet intelligi quod totus habeat causam, quia totum secundum se producatur; et illo modo non est verum. Sic enim esset dare tempus in quo non fuit tempus; quod est falsum.

ET TUNC AD RATIONES PRINCIPALES

<Ad 1> Ad primam, cum dicitur, "Omne quod habet causam efficientem potest non esse", verum est de accidente. Et tunc ulterius solvas sicut prius.

<Ad 2> Ad aliam, "Omne quod potest corrumpi, quolibet alio etiam circumscripto, non habet causam efficientem", conceditur. Et cum dicitur in minori, "Aeterna sunt hujusmodi", falsum est;[14] nam circumscripto primo motore et intelligentia, nihil movebit.[15]

<Ad 3> Ad aliam, "Quod non habet causam materialem, etc.," concedo. Et cum dicitur in *B*, "Accidentia talia sunt aeterna", dico quod habent materiam ad ubi, et hoc sufficit eis.

<Ad 4> Ad aliam, cum dicitur, "Illud quod habet materiam ad esse parte[16] sui habet causam efficientem", concedo. Et[17] cum dicitur quod ipsa sunt talia, dico quod materia ad esse sive potentia potest esse duplex. Quaedam est potentia ad esse quia ad formam. Et quia talis forma non acquiritur nisi mediante motu et transmutatione, et motus et transmutatio necessario habent causam efficientem, hinc est quod habens talem materiam habet causam efficientem. Sed alia est potentia ad esse, quia est quaedam natura possibilis quae habet esse, et non habet eum motu et transmutatione; et pro tanto non debet habere causam efficientem.

<Ad 5> Ad aliam, cum dicitur, "Omne habens aliquam (123^{rb}) passionem qua potest carere habet causam efficientem", conceditur. Et cum dicitur, "Aeterna sunt talia", dico quod falsum est. Et cum probatur de mente Commentatoris in XII,[18] qui dicit quod caelum potest moveri et non moveri, dico quod Commentator non vult dicere quod caelum possit simpliciter moveri et non moveri,[19] sed hoc quia caelum de se non habet sufficientia omnia principia requisita ad motum, quia requiritur motor, a quo habet quod aeternaliter moveatur.

Sed tu dices: "Illud nihil est, quia Commentator in eodem XII[20] dicit quod motor potest movere et non movere". Dico quod Commentator dicit quod motor potest movere et non movere si in ipso posset fieri aliqua transmutatio. Et quia interimendo consequens: impossibile est in eo fieri aliquam transmutationem, ideo concludes quod impossibile est[21] ipsum moveri et non moveri.[22]

Auctoritates autem sunt solutae; et sic de isto.

Explicit quaestio Johannis de G<anduno>.[23]

---

[14] *Om. V.*

[15] manebit *V.*

[16] partem *F.*

[17] *Om. V.*

[18] Averroes, *In XII Metaph.* t. c. 41, 324I-325A.

[19] *Om. V.*

[20] *Loc. cit.*, t. c. 30, 314K.

[21] *Om. V.*

[22] movere *V.*

[23] Johannis de Ganduno: etc. *V.*

Mediaevalia

I. Chaucer's Cook-Host Relationship.

EARLY in the *Canterbury Tales*, right after the Reeve's Tale, the Cook volunteers to tell a story and the Host accepts his offer. Then there occurs a tiff between these two Pilgrims, in which the Host points to certain unsavory aspects of the Cook's business methods and the Cook threatens to tell, before the pilgrimage ends, a story which will expose the questionable dealings of innkeepers. For the moment, however, the Cook relates the fragmentary tale of Perkin the Reveller. Much later, toward the end of the *Canterbury Tales*, we find the Manciple's Prologue. Here the Cook is exceedingly drunk, and the Host pokes fun at him in calling on him for a tale; but the Manciple offers to perform in place of the drunken Cook, and the Host agrees to this proposal.

With reference to these passages, it has been urged that Chaucer meant to cancel the Cook's Prologue and Tale, and to introduce the Cook for the first time in the Manciple's Prologue. This view is based on the seeming inconsistency between the Cook's Prologue and that of the Manciple, "where the Host speaks to the Cook as if he were then first taking notice of him . . . ."[1] Recently, however, Professor W. W. Lawrence has pointed out that Harry's question in the Manciple's Prologue—"Is that a cook of Londoun . . . ?"—need not mean that the Host is there first recognizing the Cook; rather Harry may be saying "that the rascal is so drunk as to be scarcely recognizable."[2] Thus the evidence for an argument that Chaucer intended to cancel the Cook's Prologue and Tale seems exceedingly flimsy. In this connection there is, I think, another way of interpreting Harry's question; and, in addition, without doing any injustice to the text we may read the two scenes which present the Cook-Host relationship as part of a single dramatic situation which Chaucer may have meant us to grasp.

That the antagonism between the Cook and the Host, based on conflicting business interests, would have appeared perfectly natural to Chaucer's audience, was long ago made clear by Professor Frederick Tupper: the laws of the time prohibited London innkeepers from selling food and drink in competition with victualers such as the Cook; therefore many innkeepers moved outside the city limits to Southwark, where these laws could not be enforced.[3] Also, sanitary conditions in the contemporary cookshops were so bad that laws had be be passed to ensure cleanliness.[4] Consequently, Harry's attacking the Cook for selling unsanitary food strikes close to home, and we see reason for the Cook's ending his preliminary remarks with the threat that he will repay the Host by telling a tale about innkeepers before the pilgrimage is over (I, 4359-62). Presumably, the Cook is familiar with certain touchy matters concerning Harry's operation of the Tabard Inn, matters which the Host is not eager to have aired before the company. He therefore quite understandably does not hasten, after the account of Perkin the Reveller, to invite the Cook to tell another story.

When the company reaches Bobbe-up-and-down, however, the Host begins to "jape and pleye"; the cause for his high spirits, as he jestingly points out, is that the Cook is sleeping on horseback and has therefore failed to keep up with the group. Then comes Harry's question: "Is that a cook of Londoun, with meschaunce?" (IX, 11). This question, it seems to me, means "Can it be that this man, a London cook, is overcome by drink, when London cooks are noted for their ability to handle strong drink well? If so, this situation must have occurred by some mistake or unusual circumstance." London cooks seem to have been noted for their ability to drink,[5] and that this particular Cook has had extensive experience with the bottle is evidenced by his "mormal."[6] Though the Host jeeringly offers the possibility that this unusual circumstance exists because fleas have kept the Cook awake all night, or because the Cook has spent the night with "some quene," he realizes that the Cook is "dronke" as clearly as does the Manciple (IX, 35). And, as a result of this realization, Harry calls on the Cook to do penance by telling a tale, "Although it be not worth a botel hey."

---

[1] See *Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, (ed.), Fred N. Robinson (Cambridge, Mass., 1933), pp. 791, 869-870.

[2] W .W. Lawrence, *Chaucer and the Canterbury Tales* (1950), p. 148n.

[3] *Journal .of English and Germanic Philology*, XIV (1915), 256-270.

[4] *Ibid.*

There is, perhaps, a particularly good reason for the Host's calling for a tale from the Cook at this point: still mindful of Roger's threat to tell a tale which will expose embarrassing details of innkeepers' methods of operation, Harry feels that here is an apt moment to call for another story from the Cook, since the latter, as a result of his drunkenness, has probably forgotten his former threat. But the Manciple unexpectedly breaks in, offers to take over the storytelling duty, and directs remarks at the Cook even more insulting than the Host's comments to Roger some lines earlier. As a result of the Manciple's insults the Cook becomes angry, swings at the Manciple, and falls from his horse into the mud. When the group has managed to put the Cook again upon his horse, the Host pronounces that the Cook's condition would lead him to tell a story "lewedly." Harry has just noticed from the Manciple-Cook exchange that the Cook's drunkenness, rather than making him jolly and friendly, has increased his contentiousness; thus the Host concludes that his calling for a story from the Cook at this point was a tactical error, and is pleased to have the Manciple perform instead. Had the Cook told another story here, it probably would have been aimed at exposing the chicanery of innkeepers.

It is this conclusion, I think, which leads Harry to warn the Manciple that his ridiculing the Cook may lead the latter to reveal some of the tricks whereby the Manciple hoodwinks the lawyers who live in his Inn of Court (IX, 69-75; I, 586). This advice has something more than gratuitous aspects, for the Host knows that he has run the same risk as the Manciple by jeering at the Cook. From this point of view, Harry's words in praise of "good drynke," delivered after the Manciple has put the Cook in good spirits by giving him wine, should be understood as signifying a measure of relief for the Host.

If the interpretation of the Cook-Host relationship set forth above is acceptable, then we need no longer consider the Cook's two appearances in the *Canterbury Tales* as evidence of lack of revision on Chaucer's part. Rather than thinking that Chaucer meant to cancel one of these appearances, we should realize that the two scenes make up a single dramatic antagonism involving Host, Cook, and Manciple, three businessmen who are very touchy about certain details of their operations. Further, the emphasis in the Manciple's Tale on holding one's tongue has personal application not only for the teller of this story, but also for the keeper of the Tabard Inn.[7]

R. M. Lumiansky
Tulane University.

II. The Vulgate Tradition of the *Consolatio Philosophiae* in the Fourteenth Century.

THE later textual tradition of Boethius' *Consolatio Philosophiae* has, up till now, not been studied. The textual studies of Peiper, Schepps, and Engelbrecht were mainly concerned with the earliest surviving manuscripts for the purpose of establishing the text.[1] Weinberger in the prolegomena to his edition of the *Consolatio* lists 84 manuscripts, almost all of which are of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, but his intensive study of the textual tradition has naturally concentrated on the smaller group of ten or so on which his text is based.[2]

---

[5] See pp. 264-265 of the article by Tupper in note 3 above.

[6] W. C. Curry, *Chaucer and the Mediaeval Sciences* (1926), pp. 50-52.

[7] On the dramatic aspects of the Manciple's performance, see the articles by J. B. Severs, *JEGP*, LI (1952), 1-17; and Morton Donner, *Modern Language Notes*, LXX (1955), 245-249.

The reader who approaches the study of the *Consolatio* in the later Middle Ages with only Peiper and Weinberger as guides can find no answers to such questions as these: What sort of text did Abaelard or William of Conches have before him, and how did it compare with texts Nicholas Trivet and William Whetely studied and wrote commentaries on? Was the text Jean de Meun translated the same as that Chaucer translated some eighty years later? Does the textual tradition of the *Consolatio* develop along national lines, and do textual innovations emanate from particular centers?

Conclusive and precise answers to such questions would involve the study of a considerable number of the more than 300 surviving manuscripts of the eleventh to the fifteenth century. Such a study has not yet been made. A study of the textual tradition of the *Consolatio Philosophiae* in the fourteenth century, however, does reveal the existence of a vulgate text. This fact, coupled with our knowledge of the earlier tradition, indicates that, granted the undoubted existence of minor family groups, the tremendous popularity of the *Consolatio*, bringing about as it did the mass production of manuscripts from the eleventh century onward, led gradually and inevitably to the development of a vulgate tradition.

Extensive collation of 43 manuscripts[3] reveals the existence of a vulgate tradition in the fourteenth century and provides a paradigm of the various stages in the development of this tradition. The decisive evidence for the existence of this vulgate tradition is that by the fourteenth century certain older readings appear to have disappeared and been replaced by new readings in all the manuscripts:

11, 19 delatae (delatum T^{2}E)][4] *om.* Vc, delatum *rel.*

---

[1] *A.M.S. Boetii Philosophiae Consolationis Libri Quinque*, ed. Rudolph Peiper (Leipzig, 1871); Georg Schepps, *Handschriftliche Studien zu Boethius De Consolatione Philosophiae* (Würzburg, 1881); August Engelbrecht, "Die Consolatio Philosophiae des Boethius," *Sitzungsberichte der Philosophisch-Historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, CXLIV (1902), Abhandlung III, 1-60.

[2] *A.M.S. Boethii Philosophiae Consolationis Libri Quinque*, ed. Wilhelm Weinberger (Vienna and Leipzig, 1934), pp. XIV-XXX.

[3] All manuscripts are of the fourteenth century unless otherwise indicated: BM, *Ms Arundel* 179 (A); BM, *Mss Add.* 14792 (D), 17298 (M), 17406 (E), 19585 (N) s. XIV/XV, 22766 (L), 27875 (S); BM, *Mss Burney* 129 (Bu), 130 (Bur); BM, *Mss Harleian* 2516 (Hr), 2517 (Ha), 2518 (H); BM, *Ms Royal* 15 A XXX (Y); Bibl. S. Angelica in Rome, *Ms* 1365 (Ag); Amiens, *Ms* 407 (Am); BN, *Mss Latin* 6404 (B), 6641 (F), 9321 (T), 9322 (K), 11856 (O), 12962 (Z), 14381 (P), 16094 (G), 18424 (J); Oxford, Bodleian *Cod. Canonici* 80 (Bo), 138 (Bd), 182 (Be); *Ms D'Orville* 102 (X); *Ms Rawlinson* G.187 (R); Oxford, *Ms* New College CCLXV (No); Cambridge University Library, *Mss* Ii.III.21 (Ca) s. XIV/XV, Mm.II.18 (Mm); Cambridge, Peterhouse *Ms* 275 (Pe); Reims, *Ms* 874 (Re); Tours, *Ms* 694 (To); Vatican, *Mss Latin* 562 (Vc), 564 (V), 10504 (Va), 10674 (Vp); Vatican, Urbinatis *Latin Ms* 677 (Vs); Harvard College Library, *Mss Norton* 1000 (Ch), 1001 (C); University of Illinois, *Ms* 9 (I).

This group comprises French *Mss* — FGKReTTo, Italian *Mss* — BDMRVVc, English *Mss* — CaMmPeY, and German *Mss* — AI. Various types of manuscripts are also represented: scholars' copies—BFGRe, monastic books — AAmRToZ, an elaborate book for a wealthy patron—T.

All manuscripts were collated for: Books I and II complete; Book III, proses 1, 2, 10; Book IV, prose 6; Book V, prose 3; and additional spot passages.

[4] Page and line references are to Weinberger's edition and the material in parentheses is drawn from his apparatus. *Mss* used by Weinberger and cited here are: Munich, *Ms* 18765 (T) s. IX; St. Gall, *Ms* 844 (F) s. IX; Florence, Laurentian *Ms* XIV 15 (L) s. IX; Vatican, *Ms* 3363 (V) s. IX; Orleans, *Ms* 270 (Aur.) s. IX; Bern, *Ms* 179 (K) s. IX/X; Munich, *Ms* 14324 (E) s. X/XI; Laon, *Ms* 439 s. IX. A^1=A before correction or addition; A^2=A after correction or addition.

12, 6 tamen convictumve (tamen *del.* TLV)] conuictumque CaMm, conuictumne R, conuictumue *rel.*
12, 7 muti (moti T^{2}L^{1}V^{2}KE^2)] remoti AgBdEFJMmRVaVc, amoti Bo^{1}PeS^1, moti Bo^{2}S^2 *rel.*
13, 14 affingitur (affigitur T^2)] affligitur BdChVp, affigitur *rel.*
14, 12 nocti (noctis V^{2}Aur.)] nactis Y, noctis *rel.*
20, 19 animi tui (statum *in ras.* V)] statum serentitatemque *add.* Ca, serentitatem *add.* K, statum *add. rel.*
28, 16 pudicitia (pudicitiae T^{2}LV^2)] pudicicieque A, pudicicie *rel.*
32, 7 ac (aut T^2, an KV)] aut CER, *om.* G, an *rel.*
57, 5 degeneret (degenerent T^{2}L Aur.^{2}DE)] degenerent *all Mss.*
59, 5 Lyncei (Lynceis V^{2}Aur.^{2}DKE, linceis T^{2}L)] in inceis Mm, linceis *rel.*
72, 11 nihil unum cuncta (nihilum cuncta T^{2}V^{2}KE)] nihil Vc, nihilum cuncta *rel.*

These vulgate readings of the fourteenth century appear earlier in the tradition. Most of them, but not all, appear as contemporary corrections in the early ninth century manuscript *T* (Munich 18765), and this manuscript and others related to it must have been important in the transmission of these readings. On the other hand, *E* (Munich 14324), a late tenth or early eleventh century manuscript, maintains several of the older readings: 12, 6 *tamen convictumve*; 13, 14 *affingitur*; 14, 12 *nocti*; 20, 19 *animi tui*; 32, 7 *an*. It must be concluded then that, although these vulgate readings appear early in the tradition as we know it, they cannot have carried the field before the eleventh century. Nor is it possible to determine the particular point at which any older reading has been driven out of currency. This concise study does indicate, however, that by the fourteenth century a new vulgate tradition has become established.

The development of a vulgate tradition is the result of a gradual and continuous process in which older readings are replaced by new ones. In this process, a variant reading, for linguistic, paleographical, or less predictable and ascertainable reasons, enters the tradition and continues to be copied. The more it is copied the more it will be copied, so that eventually the chances of any scribe coming across an exemplar containing the older reading become less and less; and consequently the older reading is submerged and replaced. Such appears to be the situation in the readings cited above. But the gradualness and continuousness of the process means that at the same time we also find instances in which the older reading, although it seems clearly on the way to being totally submerged, still holds on in as few as one or two manuscripts or in a small minority. Here there is more activity in the way of marginal and interlinear corrections and additions as well as a greater number of variant readings than in the more stable condition illustrated above:

2, 6 signarem (designarem VKE^2)] signarem FOPY, desingarem E, designarem *rel.*
2, 22 in utrasque (inter utrasque T^{2}VE)] in utrasque Y, inter utrasque *rel.*
4, 1 aucta (acta F^{2}K^2)] aucta Ca^{1}E^{1}R^{1}Y, acta Ca^{2}E^{2}R^2 *rel.*
8, 10 exempla (exemplar T^2)] exempla FRV, exemplar *rel.*
9, 1 imbecilli] imbecilli GK, imbecillis Re^2 *rel.*
10, 15 cessavit (cessabit KAur.^{2})] cessauit ChGMMmPeRe^{1}ToY, cessabit Re^2 *rel.*
15, 24 laetetur] *om.* G, letetur Y, lectatur BdD^1, letatur D^2 *rel.*
15, 26 sanctum (s*anctum T^1, sancitum T^{2}V^{2}K)] stanctum Y^1 (sanctum Y^2), sancitum AgAmBBdBeBuChDEFGHHaHrKLMMmNNoPVVaVpVsX, sanctitum ABoBurCJOPeRReSTToVcZ, sanxitum I, sanccinitum Ca.
16, 15 adversum (adversus PK)] aduersum BoChFGRToVs, aduersus *rel.*
28, 6 luas (luis T^2)] luas FGKMmOPeReY, luis *rel.*

29, 6 aliquantum] aliquantum HHrKPRY, aliquentisium G, aliquantulum *rel.*

31, 8 praesens (praesens <vita> F^1 [vita *s.s.* T felicitas, vita *s.s.*V])] praesens Be^{1}Hr^{1}OPVp^{1}Vs, felicitas *add.* Ha, praesens uita *ins.* E^2, uita *add.* Be^{2}Hr^{2}Vp^2 *rel.*

38, 21 restinguere] restinguere DSVs^{1}Y^1, extinguere AmBurLTVc, et ingenere K^1 (extinguere K^2), restingere FGPY^2, rextringere *in ras.* Vp, restringere Vs^2 *rel.*

43, 25 nihil (*eras.* Laud., non nihil V^2)] nihil GT, *om.* CaE^1(nihil *ins.* E^2)FKPe ToY, non Mm, non nihil *rel.*

48, 28 bonum suum] suum *in ras.* Re, bonum suum AE^{1}IKORVsY, summum bonum E^2 *rel.*

65, 31 ab (*eras.* V] ab BdBoBuChDMNoOPeTZ, id Ca, *del.* Bur, *om. rel.*

68, 6 vere] uere FKPRe(?)VVsY, uero Ch, uera *rel.*

98, 29 censuerunt (censuerint T^{2}V^2)] censuerunt BeBuCaJLMmNS^{1}YZ, censuere E, censerit R, censuerint S^2 *rel.*

As has been suggested, this synchronic view gained from a study of a representative group of fourteenth century manuscripts permits an inference as to what must have been the historical process. Thus those readings presented first, which must represent the final stage in the development of a vulgate tradition, could, if a sufficiently earlier cross-section were taken, be found to illustrate the earlier stage which has just been illustrated. Furthermore, as would be expected, these manuscripts also provide other examples of what, in chronological perspective, might be considered the first stage of this development, that is, where a new or several new readings have gathered sufficient backing to challenge the established one. At this juncture, there is the greatest activity on the part of correctors and the greatest variety in the text. The *status quo* has been disturbed, and there has to be considerable struggle before a new homogeneity can be established.

2, 11 statura] natura D, eius *add.* AgAmBurCChEHHaJM^{2}MmS^{2}TTo^{2}VaVc Vp^{2}Vs.

6, 13 traherent] detraherent AAgAmBBdBeCaChFHHaHrIJMNoPPeRTo VVaX, retraherent EVc.

8, 20 conscii] estis *add.* A^{2}AgAmBdBeBoDEHHa^{2}HrLMMmNNoPPeRSTTo VVaX, confitii estis G (conscii *ins.* G^2), conscii estis *ins.* Bur^2, *om.* C.

9, 1 Conigastum] coniugastum AgBBdBoBurChHHrMNRSVaVcVsY, cogiugastum O.

12, 13 me] meam AAgBdBeBuBurCEGKTVs, me meam AmBChHaHrIVaZ, mei F, *om.* J.

15, 22 reminiscare (reminiscaris V)] reminiscaris AAmBeBoCaGHHrJKNo P^{1}PeRe^{1}SToVpVsYZ.

19, 3 grates] ago *add.* AAgCaFNoSV, refero *add.* AmBBdBoBuHa^{2}LMNRTVa, referamus *add.* BurX, referimus *add.* BeE, referimus *s.s.* Vs, reddo *add.* MmTo, agitamus *add.* G.

29, 19 expertus] et *add.* A^{3}BBoBurCChFGHrKMmNNoPeRe(et *del.*)TToVc VsXZ, expertusue E, uel expertus J.

31, 4 afferre (auferre V^2)] auferre AAmB^{2}Bo^{1}BuBurCaChFGJ^{2}KLMMm OPReS^{2}TVcZ, auferre *in ras.* To, auferre *in mg.* Pe^2.

64, 25 id imminutione] id diminucione AmBBeBo^{2}CCaDGHIMNNoRReSToX, illud diminucione T, inminucione PeVa, diminucione Vc, id in diminucione FLPVVs^{2}Y, in diminucione Vp(in *del.*, id *ins.* Vp^2)Z, ad inminucione E^1, ad inmucione Bd, a diminucione Ch, inmitacione Bu.

67, 2 deus] est *add.* AgAmBdBoBurCHHaHr^{2}JLP^{2}RSToVVaVpVsX.

98, 13 ipsas . . . immutabiles (ipsam immutabilem T^{2}V^2] ipsam . . . immutabilem BdBeBoBurCDHHa^{1}HrIJLNNoPRe^{2}VVcVpXZ, ipsam . . .

immobilem T, ipsam B(immobilem *ins.* B^{2}), ipsas . . . immobilem AmM, ipsas . . . immobiles Ca, ipsas . . . connexiones F.

101, 9 spectans (spectans T^{2}L, et spectans Aur.^{2}, expectans *rel.*)] expectans ABBdBoBurChHrINoOPeVcVpVs, spectans *in ras.* BePY, expectant G, portans F.

102, 2 divinae operae] diuini operis AAgBeBurChEFHaKLNoPPeRSTTo VaVp^{2}YZ, diuine operis BH^{2}Hr (*in ras.*), diuini opere DRe^{2}, ordinis Vc.

110, 24 perturbere (perturbere DLV^{1}, perturbaere E, perturbare *rel.*)] perturbare AmBdBuChGIJKMmNoOPSToVVaVcY, conturbare BN, conturbere ABe, perturbaris LVp, turbare Ca.

It should be noted that here, in contrast to the other stages, the new readings are generally not found in the earliest manuscripts. This is further striking evidence of the continuousness of the movement toward a new vulgate version of the *Consolatio Philosophiae.*

The tremendous popularity of the *Consolatio* was the necessary pre-condition for the development of this vulgate tradition. This popularity manifested itself in continued studying, glossing and commenting upon, and translating the work; and such popularity in turn demanded a steady production of copies. Studying, glossing, commenting made the introduction of new readings inevitable; the tremendous multiplication of copies made the acceptance of these new readings possible. But if popularity encouraged diversity, in the case of the textual history of Boethius' *Consolatio* it also demanded homogeneity and standardization. Thus we have seen examples of the initial diversity resulting from the new readings gathering enough support to challenge the older ones and of the final homogeneity of the vulgate version in which the older reading has been replaced.

Although the questions posed at the beginning of this study cannot yet be fully answered, a few examples drawn from the translations of the *Consolatio* of Jean de Meun and Chaucer will perhaps suffice to demonstrate the importance of the discovery of this vulgate tradition to the answering of such questions. In each of the following examples both translations correspond to the vulgate reading:

Weinberger[5]	Vulgate reading	J. de Meun[6]	Chaucer[7]
12, 7 muti	moti	remeu (esmeus)	remuwed
14, 12 nocti	noctis	de la nuit	of the night
20, 19 animi tui	statum *add.*	l'estat de ton courage	the estat of thi corage
28, 16 pudicitia	pudicicie	de chastee	of chastete
32, 7 ac vis	an vis	ou force	or might
57, 5 degeneret	degenerent	il . . . forlignent	thei . . . owtrayen or forlyven
2, 22 in utrasque	inter utrasque	entre	bytwixen
4, 1 aucta	acta	demenee	dryven to and fro
10, 15 cessavit	cessabit	cessera	schal cese
31, 8 praesens	presens uita	present vie	present lif
38, 21 restinguere	restringere	restraindre	restreyne
48, 28 bonum suum	summum bonum	le souverain bien	the sovereyne good

Clearly the solution to such a specific problem as the extent of Chaucer's reliance on the translation of Jean de Meun depends upon our knowledge of the state of the texts they used.[8] Finally, it is equally clear that our understanding of the works on and the influences of the *Consolatio Philosophiae* in the later Middle Ages will be more secure when supported by a knowledge of the textual tradition at that time.

---

[5] The order here corresponds to that in which these examples were cited above.

[6] Citations are from the critical edition of V. L. Dedeck-Héry, *Mediaeval Studies,* XIV (1952), 165-275.

[7] Citations are from *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson (Boston, 1933).

[8] Professor Dedeck-Héry's study of this problem does not give much consideration

Barnet Kottler
Duke University.

III. On the Sources of *The Prioress's Tale.*

OF Chaucer's three devotional tales—*The Parson's Tale*, *The Second Nun's Tale*, and *The Prioress's Tale*—probably that of the Prioress has been the least understood. A reason for some of the misunderstanding seems to be connected with a misinterpretation of Chaucer's imagery and the meaning behind the symbols that are employed in this tale. This note attempts to shed some light on the nature of this imagery by interpreting Chaucer's symbols in a way that seems consistent with the nature of the subject matter which Chaucer was treating and with the sources that he was here drawing upon. These sources, which have not heretofore attracted sufficient notice, are briefly examined and some attempt made to evaluate their influence on the author's choice and treatment of his subject matter.

My interpretation is based upon the recognition that in the three devotional tales, at least, Chaucer's imagery derives no longer from the mediaeval courtly tradition but from sources associated with the Church. The symbols that Chaucer uses in these tales are the symbols found in the liturgy and their meaning is the meaning that ecclesiastical tradition has assigned to them. This fact is born out by the imagery and symbolism of all three of these tales. I shall state briefly only a few of the more general characteristics.

In both the *Parson's Tale* and the *Second Nun's Tale* the imagery chosen suggests the sharp opposition between the foulness and contagion of the earthly and temporal as against the beauty and purity of the heavenly and eternal. In choosing the story of St. Cecilia, Chaucer takes over the legend's own imagery and symbolical framework. The lily appears as the traditional symbol of chastity; the rose is seen as a symbol of immutable love of the divine in the crowns of roses and lilies which are brought to Valentine and Cecilia. In keeping with the repulsiveness of the many descriptions of earthly existence in the *Parson's Tale*, Chaucer has the Second Nun describe herself as

> Me, flemed wrecche, in this desert of galle (G 58)[1]

and pray to the Virgin Mary to deliver her soul from this earthly prison, from the "contagioun" of her body (G 72-3). The sharp contrast between the mutable and the eternal is everywhere in evidence.

An element that I shall have further occasion to comment upon in the *Prioress's Tale* involves the nature of Cecilia's final transfiguration. Like the little lad in Asia, she has her throat cut and speaks for the last time as she hovers, in torment, between life and death. We have another instance of this method in the legend of Dido in *The Legend of Good Women*. There Dido is compared to the wounded white swan that sings before it sinks to its death in the watery

---

to this problem. Although there can be no doubt that Chaucer used the French version, the extent of this dependence is still to be determined; for some of the examples that Dedeck-Héry cites to establish this dependence must be rejected as a result of our knowledge of the vulgate tradition. See V. L. Dedeck-Héry, "Jean de Meun et Chaucer, Traducteurs de la Consolation de Boèce," *PMLA*, LII (1937), 979-980 — examples from Book I, nos. 4, 10, 15; Book II, no. 5; Book III, no. 6. Many more of his examples will have to be rejected on the basis of a more complete knowledge of the Latin textual tradition, but this will not impair the soundness of his thesis.

[1] References to and citations of Chaucer's text are made from F. N. Robinson (ed.), *The Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston, 1933).

grasses below (F 1355-6). In each case it is purity and innocence that lies smitten by a mortal wound of the world and pauses awhile before its entry into the sublime. But in the devotional tales this technique acquires a special significance. Cecilia reveals that she asked God for a respite of three days so that she might instruct her followers a little longer (B^2 *542-6), and the tiny lad in the *Prioress's Tale* does not seem to mind his agony so long as he can sing in praise of the Virgin. It is the doctrine of willfully assumed suffering that is here presented. The poet lingers over the death-scenes as if trying to fix the spot at which the great transition commences. He is here like some astronomer of a spiritual cosmos, trying to focus his glass upon that inscrutable nebula where the mutable terminates and the changeless begins. In hypnotic fascination, he watches the transfiguration of a soul.

The Prioress's Tale begins with an invocation to the Blessed Virgin, and once again the symbols of purity and innocence are utilized. She is called a white lily flower, the symbol of chastity, and a burning bush, the symbol of love and devotion. Particularly interesting is the introduction of the child theme at the end of the Prologue:

> But as a child of twelve month oold, or lesse,
> That kan unnethes any word expresse,
> Right so fare I, and therefore I yow preye,
> Gydeth my song that I shall of you seye (B^2 *484-7).

This picture of the Prioress as a helpless child appealing to the Virgin to help it to utter the praise of her that it wants to sing, is a magnificent anticipation of the final incident of the tale which involves a closely similar situation. This is the manner of Chaucer's maturity.

The poet has taken over the *Alma redemptoris* as the anthem which the little *clergeon* sings from other versions of the legend; most of these versions utilize the *Gaude Maria*, and only a small group makes use of the *Alma redemptoris*. But Chaucer's dramatic instinct must have directed the choice of the *Alma redemptoris* since its words are particularly appropriate not only for the situation at the end but for the wider symbolism that is doubtless intended in the story. Its words exhort the mother of the Redeemer, the star of the sea, to come to the aid of the sinking and oppressed who are in her care. The little lad is given a vague notion of this idea by his older classmate, and it is thus natural that he should attempt to sing the words in his last bitter extremity.

Chaucer's use of church liturgy and liturgical symbolism are particularly striking in this tale. Commentators have pointed out numerous scriptural sources; Sister Madaleva has noted a number of parallels to passages and ideas in the Prioress's Prologue and the Office of the Blessed Virgin.[2] In his edition, Robinson's notes contain an interesting reference which, if pursued, leads to some rather startling discoveries. He states that he was informed by Mr. Joseph Dwight that the reference to Rachel, in B^2 *627, occurs, along with the psalm *Domine, Domine noster*, in portions of Scripture read at Mass on the Feast of the Holy Innocents.[3] Professor Robinson suggests that the comparison of the bereaved mother to Rachel would be natural in itself and would be suggested by a reading of the Scriptures; but he also indicates the possibility of the reference to Rachel in the liturgical texts as the source of their association in the tale.

Now Chaucer is telling the story of the murder of a Christian child by the Jews; he (or rather the Prioress) never allows us to forget that it is the Jews who are the perpetrators of the dreadful crime. On the other hand, the biblical reference to Rachel in Jeremias (XXI, 15) refers to the slaughter of the children of Benjamin who were certainly Jews themselves. This does not suggest any real parallel to the murder of the little *clergeon*, a murder perpetrated by the members of a Jewish community. If we turn, then, to the liturgical text indicated by Professor Robinson, we find in the *Gospel of St. Matthew* (ii, 18), read on the Feast of the Holy Innocents, a reference to Rachel of just such a nature as Chaucer desired. This Gospel refers to the *Jeremias* passage in a context that gives it an entirely different colouring. The slaughter of the children of Benjamin is brought into relationship with the children slaughtered by Herod in his attempts to take the life of Jesus. This secondary association of the Rachel passage in the *Gospel of St. Matthew* does not seem to me to be of a kind that would impress itself on the memory unless the attention were focussed upon it by strong external means. The Feast of the Holy Innocents on December 28th, at which this Gospel is central, provides just such a powerful external stimulus. The suggestive power of the liturgy and the ceremonies at this feast would probably do much more toward determining the associative nature of the Rachel figure than could the consecutive reading of scripture in this connection.

---

[2] *Chaucer's Nuns* (New York, 1925), pp. 30 ff.

[3] *Ed. cit.*, p. 841.

If we look for further evidence in this regard, we find that there is a direct reference to Herod,

O cursed folk of Herodes al newe (B^2 *573),

which seems to suggest that Chaucer's train of thought was bound up with the murder of the infants, which followed the birth of Christ. This is further strengthened by Chaucer's use of the psalm *Domine, Dominus noster* as the heading and the first lines of the Prologue for this tale. This psalm occurs at the Introit of the Mass of the Innocents. I think it is very significant that Chaucer quotes *only* those lines from this psalm, which occur at the Introit of the Mass; and further, these are also the only words from the psalm which are used at this Mass.

In addition, note that the words

O grete God, that parfournest thy laude
By mouth of innocentz (B^2 *607-8),

are a further repetition of the lines in *Psalm* viii which open the Introit of the Mass on this feast. I would attach significance to the words "parfournest thy laude" which appear to be a literal translation of the Latin *perfecisti laudem* (*Ps* viii, 3); and Chaucer seems to have preserved some of the Latin phonetics for sonority. The full passage in the Introit (Officium) reads:

> Ex ore infancium, deus, et lactencium perfecisti laudem propter inimicos tuos.[4]

The last three words *propter inimicos tuos* are replaced in Chaucer by "lo, heere thy myght!" (B^2 *608) which is, in fact, an adaptation of the Latin passage to the situation that the poet is describing. For the particular enemies of God in this tale are the murderers of the little *clergeon*, and Chaucer is about to reveal how God in this instance has confounded them by the voice of a child.

The passage which begins at B^2 *579 furnishes even stronger evidence for this line of inquiry. At this point the Prioress makes an invocation to the martyrs confirmed in virginity who follow the celestial Lamb forever.

and synge a song al newe,
That nevere, flesshly, wommen they ne knewe (B^2 *584-5).

The reference in these eight lines, drawn from the *Apocalypse* xiv, 1-5, is found in the epistle for the Mass of the Holy Innocents, and the last two lines are almost a literal translation of several of the Latin phrases which run, in part:

---

[4] *Westminster Missal* I (ed. J. W. Legg, London, 1891), p. 51; *Sarum Missal* (ed. J. W. Legg, Oxford, 1916), p. 32; *Rosslyn Missal* (ed. H. J. Lawlor, London, 1899), p. 6. The *Missale Romanum* of 1474 is of interest as a somewhat later corroboration of these early texts which were in use in England in Chaucer's day.

> Et cantabant quasi canticum novum ante sedem . . . Hii sunt qui cum mulieribus non sunt coinquinati: virgines enim sunt.[5]

This passage, added to those already mentioned (i.e. the references to the whole of the Introit, to Herod in the Gospel,[6] and to Rachel in both the Gospel and the Communion[7]), would seem sufficient to point the evidence in a certain definite direction. But there is still further evidence available.

At Vespers on the Feast of the Holy Innocents the following reading and Antiphon are prescribed:

> *V.* Ex ore infantium.
> *In evangelio. Ant.* Hii sunt qui cum mulieribus non sunt coinquinati. virgines enim sunt. et secuntur agnum quocumque ierit.
> *Ps.* Magnificat.[8]

These sections (with the exception of the *Magnificat*) are a repetition of the passages from the Mass which are so closely paralleled in Chaucer's narrative. Immediately following the *Magnificat* there is prescribed a commemoration of St. Thomas of Canterbury (St. Thomas Becket) whose feast falls on the following day, December 29th, and this *Oratio* (or Collect) is chanted:

> Deus cuius ecclesia gloriosus pontifex thomas gladiis occubuit: presta quesumus. ut omnes qui eius implorant auxilium. petitionis sue salutarem consequantur effectum. per.[9]

This direct mention of St. Thomas and of his martydom by the swords of the wicked is significant. The fact that these tales which Chaucer is telling are the tales of Canterbury pilgrims and the fact that St. Thomas was slain while praising God in his cathedral, just as the little *clergeon* was slain while singing the praise of the Virgin Mary, all point to the identical conclusion suggested by the parallels thus far examined. This conclusion consists in the probability that it was the liturgy of the Feast of the Holy Innocents which first inspired Chaucer to use the particular tale the Prioress tells.

This much seems clear even if we assume that Chaucer knew only the liturgy of the Mass and the Vespers, at which most laymen can be expected to have been present. But it is not at all unlikely that a man of Chaucer's education would have been familiar with the complete liturgy for this feast as sung in the Abbeys and the Cathedral churches. Such a familiarity would have imprinted upon his mind not only the passages already quoted but in addition some of the more striking figures used in this liturgy. An instance of this may be seen in B^2 *576, which is part of a rhetorical address to the Jews and which the teller concludes with the words:

> The blood out crieth on youre cursed dede (B^2 *578).

The reference here is to the ancient Hebrew belief that the blood of a slain man could cry out to God unless it were covered over by burial. The passage seems to be closely related to *Psalm* LXXVIII, especially to verses three and ten, which are read as the Second Nocturn:

---

[5] *Westminster Missal,* p. 52.

[6] *Ibid.,* pp. 53, 54.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Monastic Breviary of Hyde Abbey Winchester* I (ed. J. B. L. Tolhurst, London, 1932), fol. 28. See also *The Customary of the Cathedral Priory Church of Norwich* (ed. J. B. L. Tolhurst, London, 1948).

[9] This *oratio* is taken from the *oratio* of the Mass of St. Thomas, celebrated the following day. Cf. *Sarum Missal,* p. 33.

> *R.* Effuderunt sanguinem sanctorum velut aquam In circuitu ierusalem et non erat qui sepeliret.
> *V.* Vindica domine sanguinem sanctorum tuorum qui effusus est.[10]

The last sentence may have been instrumental in suggesting to Chaucer the crying out of the blood to God for vengeance.[11]

If we look further at the complete liturgy of the Holy Innocents, excluding the Mass with which we have already dealt, we shall find that many portions of it are replete with just these very passages that have clear parallels in the *Prioress's Tale*. The crucial passage from the Epistle, beginning, *Hii sunt qui cum mulieribus* . . . occurs four times in all.[12] The passage referring to Rachel also occurs four times.[13] The refrain *Vindica sanguinem* occurs at least six times as a direct invocation and several times more with slightly changed wording.[14] The sequence *Ex ore infantium* occurs twice.[15] The sentence *Cantabant sancti canticum novum ante sedem dei et agni*—a variation of that portion of the Epistle which has been shown to be directly related to B^2 583 in the *Prioress's Tale*—occurs four times.[16] In view of this evidence, I think we may adopt the conclusion previously formulated, that the liturgy of the Holy Innocents first inspired Chaucer to use the particular tale which the Prioress tells. This liturgical background makes it plain why Chaucer's imagery and symbolism in these devotional tales is, in contradistinction to the symbolism in his other works, bound up with liturgical tradition.

In the *Parson's Tale* and the *Second Nun's Tale,* the great conflict between the worldly and the spiritual finds ample representation through a certain kind of imagery. The world and the flesh are generally represented as foul, putrid, dark, and transitory, while the spiritual is shining, pure, and immutable. The same technique is employed in the *Prioress's Tale*. Worldly gain is referred to in precisely the same terms when the teller speaks of the Jewish money-lenders who were

> Sustened by a lord of that contree
> For foule usure and lucre of vileynye. (B^2 *490-1).

This imagery is intensified by the physical circumstances attending the murder of the little boy. The representatives of worldly wealth murder the child who is the type of innocence and purity, and cast the body into the filth and darkness of a local privy.

When the body of the child, which has been defiled by the ordure, is sprinkled with holy water, it begins once more to sing. The cleansing of the holy water is the ultimate sign that the child is free of the taint of the material and the flesh, which was represented by the physical impurities into which its body had been cast. This is obviously the kind of association that would be in keeping not only with Chaucer's technique in the other two tales but with the liturgical symbolism of the ceremony here described. The natural condition of the world and man is implicitly one of uncleanliness and sin, and only Grace can bring about a cleansing. The immediate reference suggested is the ceremonial sprinkling with holy water which is performed at the funeral rites and is typified elsewhere in the liturgy by the words of the *Asperges me* (*Ps.* l, 9), in particular the line *et super nivem dealbabor*—a reference which is doubly appropriate because it conveys Chaucer's inner intention through the words of a Prioress who might best be expected to direct her thoughts to such associations.

The consistency of Chaucer's imagery in this connection is to be seen in the final portions of the tale. The child says that it has been given the grace to remain alive so that it may sing the praises of Christ and His Mother. She has laid a "greyn" upon its tongue, which keeps it in this life (B^3 *656-62). This "greyn" which is placed on the child's tongue has been given a variety of interpretations ranging from a vegetable grain to a jewel. I think that the whole underlying meaning of this last section is tied up with this "greyn". The explanation is connected with Chaucer's use of imagery for the goods of this world. From our knowledge of the nature of this imagery in *The Parson's Tale,* in *The Second Nun's Tale,* and in the early portions of *The Prioress's Tale* itself, I think that the real significance of the "greyn" can hardly be missed, especially if the liturgical background is kept in mind. It is a grain and nothing more; a grain of sand, perhaps, or a grain of dust, or any other substance to denote the smallest and most valueless object in creation. It is here used to symbolize the worthlessness of earthly existence as compared to eternal existence with God. When the abbot takes away the grain from the child's tongue it dies; the abbot has thus taken away only a tiny grain in taking the child's earthly existence. The irony that underlies the incident now becomes evident. The child's earthly life was but the most worthless grain of sand as compared with the spiritual existence to which it has now passed. Yet to the onlookers it seemed that the child had lost a whole world—this earthly world—when in the spiritual view it had lost less than a speck of dust or a grain of sand. And just as the grain is the minutest of created things, so the brief burst of song to which its presence gave rise is but an infinitesimal fragment of the eternal symphony of praise which sounds to God, Who is everlasting.

---

[10] *The Monastic Breviary of Hyde Abbey,* fol. 26^v, 28.

[13] *Ibid.*, fols. 27, 27^v, 28.

[14] *Ibid.*, fol. 26 ff.

[15] *Ibid.*, fols. 27^v, 28.

[16] *Ibid.*, fols. 26, 27^v.

In addition, therefore, to what has already been said, the *Prioress's Tale* also sounds the same note of world rejection, suffering and self-sacrifice in the interest of the eternal as do the other two devotional tales, *The Parson's Tale* and *The Second Nun's Tale*. Here, too, it is Chaucer's imagery that is vital in determining the tone throughout.

J. C. Wenk
Acadia University.

IV. The *Félire Oengusso* and the *Martyrologium Wandalberti.*

THE *Félire Oengusso* is the largest and most highly developed work of early Irish religious poetry.[1] Oengus, a monk, wrote the greater part of it at Clonenagh and completed it at Tallaght, near Dublin. *FO* is dated by the reference made to the death of Donnchad, high-king of Ireland, in 797 (Prol. 221 f.). The term *félire* is peculiar to the Irish language. On the traditional assumption that the word *féil* should be rendered by 'feast', Colgan rendered it by *festilogium* and later writers described it as a 'calendar' or *martyrologium,* because it lists saints and events of sacred history in the calendaric order.[2]

The *Martyrologium Wandalberti* is the first major work of Latin religious poetry in Germany.[3] Wandalbert, a monk, began it at Cologne and finished it at

---

[1] Henceforth abbreviated as *FO*. Ed. W. Stokes (Henry Bradshaw Society Collection, XXIX, London, 1905). To the literature listed by J. Kenney, *Sources for the Early History of Ireland* I (New York, 1929), no. 272, add J. O'Hanlon, *Life and Works of Saint Aengussius Hagiographus* (Dublin, 1868), which reviews the earlier literature on the subject. Of interest for the present study are the references made to *FO* by A. Edzardi, "Die skaldischen Versmasse und ihr Verhältnis zur keltischen (irischen) Verskunst", *Beiträge z. Gesch. d. deutschen Sprache,* V (1878), 570-90.

[2] Cf. *The Martyrology of Tallaght,* ed. R. I. Best and H. J. Lawlor (Henry Bradshaw Society Collection, LXVIII, 1931), p. x, and my article "The Irish Counterparts of the Anglo-Saxon *Menologium*", *Mediaeval Studies,* XIV (1952), 98 ff. Father Grosjean rendered *félire* by 'martyrologe', *Analecta Bollandiana,* LI (1931), 117.

[3] Henceforth abbreviated as *MW*. Ed. E. Dümmler, MGH, Poetae II, 569 ff. Cf. also my "A Critical Review of Hampson's Edition of the Hexametrical *martyrologium breviatum*", *Scriptorium,* VIII (1954), 62, note 7, and "The Irish Counteparts . . .", note 39. On Wandalbert see, also, de Sollier's introduction to the *Martyrologium Usuard* (Louvain, 1714), p. xvi ff. O. Brienza, *Wandalberto di Prüm* (Speccati, 1920) was not accessible to me.

Prüm. *MW* is dated by the invocation addressed to Louis the Pious *cruento tempore functe,* June 20th. In Baronius' *Tractatio*, which to this day acts as a Preface to the *Martyrologium Romanum*, *MW* is listed among the *antiqua martyrologia*. Both *FO* and *MW* have endured in world literature as outstanding attempts to cast into poetical form the subject matter of liturgical and devotional commemorations as listed in, and in the order of, the Christian calendar and martyrology.

In his brief discussion of *MW* Dom Quentin said with reference to that *martyrologe en vers*: *la vogue était alors à ce genre d'ouvrages,*[4] but, except for the *Martyrologium poeticum*, he made no mention of other works that illustrate this *vogue*. Two years earlier Whitley Stokes had remarked in his introduction to the *FO*:[5] 'Only five metrical martyrologies are known to me, *viz.*: Baeda's Martyrologium poeticum, the Martyrologium Wandalberti, the Anglo-Saxon Menologium poeticum, the Martyrology of Gorman and the Martyrology of Oengus.' The *vogue* noted by Dom Quentin was more extensive than stated by Stokes.[6] It is not adequately explained by attributing a mnemotechnical function to such versifications.[7] It is not accidental that Irish contributions to this literature have been numerous and sustained;[8] the early Irish Church did not celebrate Masses in honour of individual saints, but commemorated (virtually all) the saints in a comprehensive manner by litanic lists in (every) Mass or litanic (vernacular) prayers,[9] or by calendaric poems. To this day only the Irish language has a distinctive term, *félire*, for the latter.

From the literary point of view, the main difficulty with 'versified' or 'metrical' martyrologies, or calendars, is to give the subject matter some internal unity. Since in the calendaric arrangement the subjects of the commemorations are decidedly not considered in their material sequence, as they would be in annalistic historiography, such unity is created by considering the total annual cycle of commemorations in its devotional function. In the tradition of versified martyrologies, *FO* and *MW* are remarkable by the fact that, from the outset, their calendaric bodies are framed by extensive prologues and epilogues that enunciate the functions of these works.[10] The central part of the Epilogue of *FO* (229-88) is an enumeration of the 'hosts' of saints with their leaders;[11] the calendaric body of *MW* is followed by an *Ymnus in omnes sanctos* that specifies the *chori superni*. In this way 'metrical martyrologies' are assimilated to 'metrical litanies'.[12] In fact, designed as devotions to be performed right through on any day, rather than to be looked up day by day, the former may be described as 'litanies in calendaric arrangement'.

The comparative study of martyrologies and calendars has been practically confined to the heortological field. Bishop pointed to some heortological relationship between *FO* and the hexametrical *martyrologium breviatum* in *Ms*

---

[4] *Les Martyrologes historiques* (Paris, 1908), p. 398.

[5] *Ed. cit.*, pp. xxix, xxxix.

[6] Cf. my "The Irish Counterparts . . .", 98, 101.

[7] For the Latin works, Bishop and Wilmart, cf. my "Studies in the Literary Tradition of the *Martyrologium poeticum*", *Proceedings of the R. Irish Academy*, LVI C (1954), 199; for *FO*, cf. Myles Dillon, *Early Irish Literature* (Chicago, 1948), p. 149. It may, of course, be questioned whether any poetical function is to be attributed to such works.

[8] See my notes on *Ms Egerton* 185, *Eigse*, VI (1951), 257-64, and on *Mss Egerton* 183, 197 and 198, *Clergy Review* N.S., XL (1955), 220-26.

[9] For a parody of such prayers, cf. Kuno Meyer (ed.), *The Vision of Mac Conglinne* in R. Thurneysen, *Sagen des alten Irland* (1901), p. 144.

[10] For a comparison between the two prologues of *MW* and the prologues later added to the *Martyrologium poeticum*, cf. my "Studies in the Literary Tradition of the *Martyrologium poeticum*".

[11] In the absence of note 4 on p. xlvi of Stokes' edition, cf. Gougaud's article on the *Commendatio animae*, *Ephem. Liturg.*, XLIX (1935) 8 ff.; my articles, "Abel's Place in the Liturgy", *Theological Studies*, VII (1946), 126-41, "The Literary Tradition of Moses in Ireland", *Traditio* VII (1951), 239 f., and those quoted in *Mediaeval Studies*, XIV (1952), note 13.

[12] There was also a *vogue* of these at that time. Cf. PL 87, 32, 39 (= PL 138, 1081), and 42. Cf. also PL 112, 1629.

British Museum *Galba* A XVIII.[13] The heortological comparison between *FO* and *MW* establishes no such relationship. Moreover, the Irish and Latin metrical works in this field have dealt in very different ways with the problem of providing variation in giving expression 365 times to the statement that on a certain date certain names are commemorated—a point that deserves closer linguistic study.[14] It is by their prologues and epilogues that such works are most clearly established as literary units and in their prologues and epilogues *FO* and *MW* show striking parallels. Although these parallels are literal in some cases, they are not considered as more than illustrations of the reality of the *vogue* noted by Dom Quentin. There is no evidence of continental acquaintance with *FO* or of Wandalbert's acquaintance with Irish sources. I am primarily concerned with these parallels in an effort to establish the real meaning of the *vogue* in these works.

WM is prefaced by poems that bear the following titles: *Invocatio, Allocutio* (addressed to the reader), *Commendatio* (addressed to Otric who inspired Wandalbert to write this metrical martyrology), *Dedicatio* (addressed to the Emperor Lothar),[15] *Propositio* (of the subject) and *Comprehensio Temporum*—a subject dealt with in *FO*, Prologue 305-8—and is followed by a *Conclusio* and the *Ymnus*. In their subject matter these sections largely correspond to the Prologue and Epilogue of *FO*.[16]

A direct comparison of the Latin with an Irish text would be incomprehensible to all except a small circle of experts. Thus, the present study would have been impossible were it not for Stokes' English translation of *FO*. In those places where I have deviated from it, I have done so with reference to his glossary in order to clarify points of comparison. Irish terms have been added in parentheses to indicate instances where literal parallels do exist or where they might be erroneously suspected from Stokes' translation.[17]

The Prologue of *FO* and the *Invocatio* in *MW* begin with an invocation to Christ; so do the metrical litanies, but in the case of the latter this invocation is necessitated by the (prose) original. Moreover, the beginning of the Prologue to *FO* and that of the *Invocatio* in *MW* show striking parallels:

FO	*MW*
Bless, O Christ, my speech,	Celsi cuncti parens, conditor aetheris,
O Lord of the seven heavens;	Orbis principium, luminis editor,
To me be given the prize of devotion,	Inventor boni, fons sine termino,
O King of the bright sun that illuminest	Audi quod precor et supplico servulus,
Heaven with much holiness!	Plebis tu caput et gloria candidae.
O King that rulest angels,	
O Lord of men! . . .	
Thy kingfolk I praise . . .	
The fair people (*cain* [*candidus*] *popul*).	

Further along in the Prologue, Oengus describes himself as 'weary' (*toarmain*) Ep. 399, 'weak' (*dedbul*) and 'wretched' (*tróg*) Prol. 25; Wandalbert says of himself that he is *aeger et anxius Invoc.* 35. Both Oengus and Wandalbert pray that their work may help them obtain the remission of their sins: *FO cin* 'crimes' Ep. 387, *MW crimina Invoc.* 18 *Concl.* 3. Oengus describes himself as 'in a great strait, in a poor body slender, skinny . . . a *pauperculus* (*bochtán*), while Wandalbert says: *Concutior nimis, curae nam stimulant horribiles mentis*

---

[13] *Liturgica historica* (London, 1918), p. 255, and my article, *Scriptorium*, VIII, 70 f.

[14] For the literary appraisal of stereotype in such versifications see my article *Mediaeval Studies*, XIV, note 39.

[15] Compare Otfried's dedication of his *Evangelienbuch* to Louis the Pious.

[16] Cf. Stokes, *ed. cit.*, p. xlii f. and Kenney, *Sources*, p. 480 f.

[17] In certain cases, I have added the Irish terms where their Latin origin seems to me indicative of their technical nature. Cf. *infra*, note 29.

ad intima Concl. 5.[18] Both Oengus and Wandalbert ask that the merits of the saints be applied to them, Oengus with reference to 'the course which the host has run' Ep. 27, and Wandalbert to the *acies bellaque fortium Invoc.* 16. In this connection, Oengus says that the saints live 'according to the commandments (*timnae=testamenta*) of the king,' while Wandalbert speaks of *tuis vivere legibus Invoc.* 28.

While it may be argued that these ideas are standard equipment of religious poetry in the early Middle Ages,[19] we find them combined with more specific ideas in both works. A large part of the Prologue to *FO* is devoted to contrasting the downfall of the heathen powers to the triumph of the saints. One of Oengus' summaries of this section may be compared to a passage in Wandalbert's *Invocatio*:

FO	*MW*
Though great are the world's kings Whose strongholds thou seest, The king that rules angels Is lord in every land (149, 159).	Rector, nempe tuo nulla renititur Nulla est imperio dura potentia:
Though we may have evil combatting, A battle with the bold *Demon*, To aid us . . . Christ remains (241).	Armis tu poteris vincere fortibus Fallens ne Zabuli vincat iniquitas.
The sinners With the abundance of their cruelty Their splendour has perished (65).	Tandem sit satis ad Tartara per scelus Cunctum perque nefas perque probia omnia Casu flebiliter tendere pessimo (21-7).
The hosts of Jesus without a fall Are joyous after triumph.	Felix coelicolis permanet . . . Regis praesidii vita perennibus (29).

The *Invocatio* in *MW* ends with these words:

> Ymnum personet hic mens humilis tibi,
> Devotusque canat te modulans homo,
> Unam cui jugiter cum patre gloriam
> Agmen praedicat in saecula lucidum.

And the *Conclusio*:

> Sanctorum retuli canens
> Hic certamina praeclaraque martyrum
> Vexilla ante oculos constitui signaque ovantium.

Various passages in Oengus' Epilogue may be compared to them: '(The *félire*) will be a lorica of piety . . . there are in it many end-rhymes (*ard*) melodising (*fris-melat* from the Greek *melos*) the terminations (*rindi*)' 78-84; 'May I be after this battle in the everlasting company of this host' 315 f.

According to the prose prefaces of *FO* in the fourteenth-century *Lebar Brecc* and in the fifteenth-century *Ms Lauds* 610, when Oengus heard of a man who used to 'search the saints of the world, as is the custom (*bés*) of all ex-laymen', he decided that 'whoever should make a song (*trírech*) of praise[20] on the saints' would gain great merit. It would appear that Oengus gave poetical form—'that the lays (*lóid*)[21] may not be tedious' Prol. 323—to a devotion in honour of (virtually) all the saints to be practiced as a morning and evening prayer by the laity and, with particular regularity, by laymen who became clerics in their old age—when it was too late for them to learn Latin.[22] The Preface in the *Lebar Brecc* adds that in its traditional form this devotion mentioned 'such saints as he [who recited this devotion] remembered'. Oengus himself described the *félire* as a private devotion: 'I pray a prayer (*itge*) to them [the leading saints] I have mentioned' Prol. 17; 'let the minds (*menmae*) of all of us be for God's people' Prol. 141.

---

[18] Wandalbert, who is generally more subjective, refers here to his old age: Serro confer opem missaque desuper / Caecum de tenebris jam revocet manus (*Invoc.* 19, and the fourth stanza of the *Conclusio*). Compare *FO*, Ep. 305: After recounting these troops, O overking not to be hidden, miserere michi.

[19] Some of these parallels are to be considered no less striking than the classical ones listed by Dümmler.

[20] In his *Ymnus* Wandalbert twice described his work as a song of praise.

[21] Also Prologue 314, 334, and February 27th.

Wandalbert, too, wrote at the inspiration of a fellow cleric. Addressing Otric he said to him in his introductory *Epistola*: *Ex me . . . petisti, ut per anni totius spatium occurentes quot diebus sanctorum festivitates et sollemnes undecumque Christianorum votorum celebritates metro digerem*, and in the *Commendatio*:

Vere sume librum . . .
Scribendum tibi quem pio rogatu
Hortatuque iubes, amice dulcis,
Hoc enim gratificum libro videbis
Digestum breviter tibi sciendi
Questum cum replicans volensque munus
De iusso inspicies labore tandem.

Finally, in the *Conclusio*, Wandalbert states:

Conscripsi breviter munere (tuo, Christe,) carmina,
Constans expetiit quae studio pervigili fides.

These two references to the 'briefness' of *MW* may be compared to the two made by Oengus to the 'swiftness' with which his *félire* 'declares the *féil* of each day' Prol. 287, 299.[23] *MW* is a *martyrologium breviatum.* In comparison with the 'historical' or narrative prose martyrologies, that is, it drastically reduces the number of commemorations per day. However, his versification is so flowery that, from a practical point of view, the result is enlargement rather than abridgement. Oengus clearly says that the abridgement (*cuimbrigud*), that is selection of commemorations, in his *félire* is due to the metre (Epil. 123), but his 591 quatrains can scarcely be described as a short-cut.

Viewing *MW* as a parallel to *Ms M*(*acon*) of the prose martyrology of Florus, Dom Quentin said that, on the one hand, Wandalbert omitted many commemorations while, on the other hand, he inserted commemorations from other, mainly local, sources. However, Wandalbert claims that his work represents substantially *sanctorum festivitates et sollemnes undecumque Christianorum votorum celebritates* (*Epistola*), *sollemnia per orbem* (*Propositio*), *sollemnia festa clara per orbem* (*Comprehensio Temporum*), that is, the mind of the Church.[24] Oengus, on the other hand, while he does claim that he 'searched out (*scrútus*) *félire* afar and anear' (Ep. 109) and that the saints mentioned by him came 'from every side over countries',[25]—so much for Wandalbert's *undecumque*—makes it quite clear that the selection of 'kings', 'princes' or 'elders' of saints is his own (Ep. 32, 46).[26] He claims, however, to have reckoned all of these leaders (Ep. 288) and that, therefore, there is now no '*félire* more *certu*'.[27] His is a *félire firchert* [*vere certum*] (Ep. 148, 156).

---

[22] Of particular importance at this point is the comparison between *FO* and other vernacular works in this field such as the Anglo-Saxon *Menologium* (*supra*, note 2) and Heinrich's versified *Litanei*, G. Ehrismann, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* II, 1 (Munich, 1922), p. 173 f. Cf. *supra* note 8.

[23] *Succinte et breviter* in the letter of St. Jerome to Chromatius and Heliodorus which prefaces the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* and which is found to this day in Baronius' *Tractatus* which prefaces the *Martyrologium Romanum.*

[24] Concors ecclesia et vox modulantium / Festivo sociat canens coetui. *Invocatio.*

[25] *FO* seems to be closely related to St. Jerome's letter to Chromatius and Heliodorus (cf. *supra*, note 23): diversarum provinciarum . . . martyrum nomina. The reference made in *FO*, Ep. 28, to the number of saints of every day as being 'more than thousands of thousands' is an Irish exaggeration of Jerome's estimate that the full list of martyrs would be between 800 and 900 per day.

[26] Cf. *supra*, note 11. Munding's distinction between calendars and martyrologies (cf.

Wandalbert does not give reasons why, for the purpose of his work, it was necessary *metro digere* or *edere* the subject matter (*Epistola*). Oengus frankly admits that in his work 'abridgement of speech' was 'under the science of harmony (*soas do chuibded* Ep. 121). Though it was 'not science (*soas*) that composed the booklet but the angelic help . . . of every martyr we enumerated',[28] *soas* was required for harmony, 'smoothness and strength of the strains' (*altae* Ep. 132). It was due to these qualities that *FO* can be sung (*gabim* Ep. 114, 173, 180; *canim* Ep. 187), even to the accompaniment of the harp (Ep. 79) or to music generally (Ep. 157). Singing of it every day should supersede the traditional prose devotion (Ep. 165). Wandalbert envisages, primarily, that his work will be read (*Commendatio* and *Propositio*); there where he uses the verb *canere* (*Concl.* 7, *Ymnus* 6), he refers to the recitation of poetry. When Oengus uses the Irish verb cognate with *legere*, he establishes a parallel to the 'reading' of the Mass (*ar-légaim*, 'to read aloud' Ep. 178, 216). Wandalbert, indeed, describes his work as a *carmen* (*Concl.* 1), but places it in the literary tradition of Christian writings in general, the works of Jerome, Augustine, Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrose, Gregory, etc. While Oengus describes his work as *cétal* (Ep. 158, June 1st), the prose prefaces place it in the tradition of Irish poetry, comparing it as it does with the works of Fothuth. It was to Fothuth that Oengus first showed his *félire*: 'They blessed each other's work of art and left many graces on him who should recite it often'. The word 'work of art' (*elathan*) occurs at the very beginning of these prose prefaces, where a statement, important for the study of the history of literature in mediaeval Ireland, is made: 'Four things are required by every work of art, namely place (*locc*), time (*aimser*), author (*persa*) and the cause of invention/writing (*faith airicc/scribind*).' The words: 'It is worth knowing in what kind of metre the *félire* was composed', in those prefaces may be compared to Wandalbert's statement in the *Epistola*: *Necessarium existimavi genera ipsorum metrorum breviter explanare*. However, the explanation of metres was required in *MW* because the poems that preface and follow the calendaric body are written in metres that differ from that of the latter; *FO*, Prologue, calendaric body and Epilogue, is written throughout in the same metre. The explanation of the metre in the preface[29] and Oengus' own reference to his metre are, therefore, a more definite assertion of the artistic character of his work than are the learned explanations given by Wandalbert of

---

my articles listed *supra*, notes 7, 11) should be compared and related to that of H. Delehaye, *Analecta Bollandiana*, XXVI (1907), 79: a calendar is a list of commemorations liturgically celebrated in one particular place; a martyrology is a combination of such calendars 'empruntant en outre des notes à des sources littéraires', and, we may add, thus providing entries for (practically) every day. On the position of *MW* in this respect, cf. Quentin, *op. cit.*, p. 399; on the position of *FO*, cf. Grosjean, *art. cit.* For the rhymed litanies (see *supra*, note 12) the following lines in that of Fulda, PL 112, 1629, are important: Cum laeti famuli celebrant haec festa benigni / Laudibus instantes nocte dieque tuis . . . Manitius, *loc. cit.*, recognized that the greatest difficulty for Wandalbert was 'die dem Metrum oft gänzlich widerstrebenden Namen in den Vers zu bringen'. The selection of names in *FO* was largely dictated by the exigencies of alliteration: Fintan / Findlug Jan. 3rd; Egemonius/Ercnat Jan. 8th; Faelan/Felix/Vitalis Jan. 9th; Felix/Fland Jan. 14th; etc.

[27] More *certu*, namely, than works such as the *Félire Adamnáin* or the poem *Enlaith betha* (cf. my article, *Mediaeval Studies*, XIV), thanks to more representative selection; cf. the use of the root *rím* in *FO*: Prol. 268, Ep. 40, 41, 46, 122, 128, 228 f., 231 f. and 317. Cf. also April 30th, July 17th, September 5th and 17th.

[28] Ep. 85-97. *MW*, Epistola: Feci quo potui non tam artis usu atque sollertia quam . . . erga me sanctorum ad id peragendum . . . favore.

[29] The explanation of the *rinnard* metre in the prose prefaces contains the Latin phrase: et si plus minusve error est. Such insertions of Latin are quite common in Irish technical literature of the Middle Ages. Further along in the explanation also the term *sillaeba* is used; Wandalbert invarialby uses *syllabae* in his explanations of the metres of *MW*.

the various classical metres used by him. In fact, these explanations emphasize the scholastic character of *MW*.[30]

Both works claim a devotional function. Oengus asserts that the recitation of his *félire* is an *arreum* for the Masses or the basic Office of a whole week, for a festival (*aurtach*) or, indeed, for all the feasts (*félisi* Ep. 177 ff.); Wandalbert states in his *Commendatio*:

Vere sume librum fide sacratum,
Sincera hunc reserens legensque mente.

This claim is not only expressive of the general spirit of the time, but is related more specifically to the subject matter.

The difference between *FO* and *MW* as regards their treatment of subject matter is connected with the difference of the functional significance of their poetical form. In his *Epistola* Wandalbert said that the subject matter of his work was

> per anni totius spatium occurrentes quot diebus sanctorum festivitates et sollemnes undecumque Christianorum votorum celebritates . . . a kalendis Januarii ad finem anni per dierum singulorum occurrentes festivitates.

In his *Propositio* he states:

Spretendos breviter signans actusque virosque
Atque dies anni reditu volvente per orbem,
Ordine quae lustrent scribens sollemnia quaeque,
Hic mihi nonnumquam sanctorum nomina leges.

And finally in the *Allocutio* he expresses himself as follows:

quaeve recursus
Nunc anni memorent bella priorum
Monstrabit modico hic corpore codex.

Oengus says that he commemorates[31] the saints 'according to the order (*urd*) in which they have gone to heaven' (Prol. 279). The *corp* of his work consists of 'a number of chapters (*caiptel*) equal in number to the days of the year' (Prol. 293, 325), arranged by the months (Prol. 301, 321). In the manner of old Irish poetry, the end of *FO* resumes the (original) beginning (Prol. 21) and the last line of the *corp*, that is, the last line of the quatrain for December 31st, 'strives to step to the calends (of January);'[32] thus 'our end is against the head of January' (Ep. 8). In thus giving full cyclical meaning to what Wandalbert describes as the *curriculum, recursus* or *re*(*volutio*) *a kalendis Januarii ad finem anni*, Oengus rightly called his poem a 'continuous song' (*cétul buan*).

In his *Epistola* to Otric Wandalbert asserted: (Because) *solemnium dierum certissima comprehensio non leviter nec facile pro librorum varietate constabat* (I called on Florus for assistance). *Ab hoc sumptis veteribus emendatis codicibus Martyrologium . . . metro edidi.* Oengus said that it was necessary for him 'to search the books and enquire for every saint' (Prol. 289, Ep. 2, 75).[33] He 'scrutinized (*scrútus*) *félire* afar and anear' (Ep. 109), 'the vast *part* of Ambrosius, the *sensus* of Hilarius (*Elar*), the *antigraph* of Hironimus and the *martarlaic* of Eusebius, also the host of books in Ireland, the *félire* of the men of the Gaels' (Ep. 137-44). The term *félire* is used here in a general sense to include both (foreign) martyrologies and the (Irish) *félire*. When we consider the multiplicity of parallels between *FO* and *MW*, the absence of any reference by Oengus to the fact that the *festivitates* were *sollemnes Christianorum votorum celebritates,* as Wandalbert stated in his *Epistola*, is most remarkable. Indeed, the interpretation of the Irish term *féil* as identical with (liturgical) feast—not to mention the many synonyms in *FO* such as *aithmet*, *aurtach*, *laithe* which Stokes rendered as 'feast'—has been the chief obstacle in the way of perceiving the function of the *félire* as set forth by Oengus.

---

[30] Cf. Hauck's article on Wandalbert, *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie* XXI (Leipzig, 1908), p. 1 ff.

[31] *Imradim*. Prol. 20/21=Ep. 564/5, also January 7th, October 11th, November 13th and December 20th.

[32] In contrast to the *Hieronymianum*, *FO* and *MW* begin with January 1st.

[33] 'From one kalend (of January) to another', Prol. 301 and Ep. 1.

There is as little awareness in *FO* of the celebration of the feasts of non-Irish saints *per orbem* (Wandalbert's *Propositio* and *Comprehensio Temporum*) as there is evidence that the commemorations of Irish saints listed by Oengus had been liturgically observed in Ireland. We have seen that Oengus twice stated that his work will 'name with speed the *féil* for each day' (Prol. 287, 299). 'In seeking the *féle* you must search with diligent keenness industriously the order of the chapters' (*ord na caiptel*) Prol. 329; 'thou wilt follow the days in thy pious booklets according to the lines (*líne*) assiduously' (Prol. 309, 334). The use of these adverbs suggests that it was Oengus' real intention to give a list of commemorations that were accurate by external standards, such as the (liturgical) calendar, rather than by internal standards. Marianus Gorman has pointed out that this can scarcely have been Oengus' intention.[34] In the following quatrain (Ep. 77)

(The *félire*) is profit to the ignorant
To whom it will be a lorica of piety;
Every group sings it (to the harp)
To ascertain the *féle.*

it is clear that the second and third lines are the important ones, especially when we consider the words of the subsequent quatrain:

There are therein many delightful end-rhymes
Melodising the line-terminations.

While *MW* applied the skill of scholarly poetry to an established Church calendar, *FO* cast into a living poetical form a devotion that expressed the conception of spiritual time characteristic of the old Irish liturgy. The parallels, therefore, between *FO* and *MW* would appear to be accidental and fundamentally irrevelant. However, the literary tradition of the *Martyrologium poeticum* seems to indicate that, while it was bound to be misunderstood because there was no real function for it, the *félire*-type of calendaric poems became known on the Continent and accepted there for esthetic reasons.[35] In the history of literature the *félire* is an interesting attempt to supply unity to an incoherent subject matter by a definite literary form.

JOHN HENNIG
Dublin, Eire.

V. A Middle English Mnemonic Poem on Usury.

As is well known, the practice of usury was ubiquitous and persistent during the later Middle Ages and hence created a social problem of exasperating magnitude to conscientious English clerics.[1] The bitter feeling that usury aroused is well voiced by the anonymous homilist of British Museum, *Ms Additional* 37, 677, fol. 100^{v}:

---

[34] *Félire húi Gormáin*, ed. W. Stokes (Henry Bradshaw Society Collection, IX, London, 1895), p. 4, and my article, *Eigse*, VI (1951), 258.

[35] Cf. my article, "Studies in the Literary Tradition . . .", referred to *supra*, note 7.

[1] The problem still concerns men of conscience: see P. Conway, "Catholic Opinions on Interest Taking," *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, LXI (1943), 73-83. There is no satisfactory treatment of usury in medieval England but a good deal of information may be found in Sir William J. Ashley, *An Introduction to English Economic History and Theory* II (4th ed. 1912), pp. 377-488; Alice Law, "English Nouveaux-Riches in the Fourteenth Century," *Trans. Royal Historical Society*, n.s. ix (1895), 49-73. Indispensable to an understanding of the canonists' involvement are the magisterial

> Abouen alle marchauntes most cursed is þe usurere; for of fyue lawes þe usurere is cursed. Ferst þe lawe of kende. Also of paynemys lawe þat philosophers holden. Þe þridde lawe is Jewes lawe, þat is þe Olde Testament, and þis acurseþ usurie in ful many places. And in the Sauter, Dauyd seyþ þat þo men schulen [be elevated] in Godis hel ("protection"), þat is heuene, þat ȝeuyþ nouȝt her money to usure. Þe ferþe lawe is Holi Gospel: for Crist seiþ in þe Gospul of Luk: ȝe shullen ȝeue ȝoure lyuynge. And if it sholle be ȝouyn, it sholde nouȝ ben solde· Þe fifþe is þe Popis lawe, in þe whiche þe þeyne of an usurere is þis: First he shal be cursed; if he be an opyn usurere he shal not be amytted to the comounyng of þe auter, noþer be beried in holi place ȝif he deie in þat synne; noþer offeryng to be don for hym. (fol. 101^{r}). Þerfore me semyþ it is pereilous to deile wiþ þis hokterie ("usury") siþ it doþ awoy charyte witoute whom no man may be sauyd . . .

Furthermore, since the Middle English homilist often enlarged the concept of usury to include profiteering in general as well as the specific phases of charging interest on consumption loans, he often subsumed his indignation under the topic of avarice in his homilies against the seven deadly sins, and under the topic of theft in his application of the Ten Commandments.

In treating theft, the anonymous homilist of British Museum, *Ms Additional* 2398, says:

> The seuenþe heste ys forbade al maner doying away of oþer mennes godes vnskilfulliche aȝenst his wille þat oweþ hem and also wykkede getynge of god wiþ gyle, as by wyȝtes, by mesure, by drede of lordschip—as doþ þe kynges minysteres; oþer by extorsions as doþ wykkede lordes; oþer by usuri; oþer by gyle as doþ false marchauntz in bygylyng of here euencristen ("fellow Christens") syllyng a badde þyng for a good . . . (fol. 3^{v})

Since the homilist was most anxious to have his strictures taken to heart and translated into action, it is surprising that not more mnemonic versifications of such admonitions, such as that presented in this article, have survived in the vernacular. Briefly, mnemonic or functional verse, which has the didactic purpose of rendering "useful" facts easy to commit to memory, played an important role in mediaeval England. Professor Rossell Hope Robbins in his invaluable *Secular Lyrics of the XIVth and XVth Centuries* (Oxford, 1952) reminds us—inter alia—that the anonymous Middle English mnemonic *Instructions for Purchasing Land* survives in fourteen manuscripts; and that Lydgate's *Dietary*, a very popular treatise on health, has survived in forty-six manuscripts, a number exceeded only by the great literary poems such as *The Canterbury Tales* and *Piers Plowman*.

The purpose of the present article is to make available the text of a hitherto unprinted anonymous versified attack on usury preserved (uniquely, I believe) in British Museum, *Ms Egerton* 2810, fol. 180^{v}-181^{r}.[2] The copy is presumably apograph and belongs to the mid fifteenth century. In several parts of the text the ink is badly faded, and I am greatly indebted to Mr. T. C. Skeat, deputy keeper of Western Manuscripts in the British Museum for his kindness in recovering the readings concerned with the aid of ultra-violet light. The text contains several Northern forms, such as the spelling *quen* for "when", and the verbal forms *mas* and *tas* for "makes" and "takes"; hence we may conjecture

---

articles of T. P. McLaughlin C.S.B.: "The Teaching of the Canonists on Usury," *Mediaeval Studies*, I (1939), 81-147; II (1940), 1-22. A penetrating analysis of the ideology, from different points of view, is presented by B. J. Nelson in *The Idea of Usury* (Princeton, 1949), and R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (New York, 1926), pp. 39-41, 43-54.

[2] Carlton Brown & Rossell H. Robbins, *The Index of Middle English Verse* (New York, 1943), No. 2671.

that the author was a Yorkshireman or a Scot. The text illustrates the usual features of mnemonic verse: cramped syntax, ambiguity of reference in personal pronouns, restricted and iterated vocabulary, and emphasis on exposition from a practical point of view.

The literary tradition which this text follows is the same as that followed in the anonymous prose treatise known as Jacob's Well, preserved uniquely in Salisbury Cathedral, *Ms* 103,[8] and edited for *The Early English Text Society* (*OS* No. 115) in 1900 by Dr. A. Brandeis. Unfortunately only one volume of this edition appeared: the text is incomplete, and the introduction, in which Brandeis might have identified the ultimate source for the text, lacking. The relevant passage on the twelve types of usury appears on pp. 122-124 of the first volume. The same tradition is preserved in a fifteenth century prose version in British Museum, *Ms Harley* 45, fol. 63^v-64^r, which has not hitherto been published. I print it below because it serves as a useful parallel to the Egerton text, and offers a version with a less involved grammatical structure. This literary tradition, which may be called for convenience the "Jacob's Well" tradition, may be contrasted to the "Aȝenbit of Inwyt" tradition, which appears also in the Middle English *Vices and Virtues* and in Caxton's *Royal Book* (*ca.* 1486), and which derived ultimately from the *Somme des Vices et Vertues* of Lorens d'Orleans.[4] The "Aȝenbite" traditon describes seven types of usury: lending against collateral; using inherited money originally won by usury; lending at interest through agents (especially Jews and Saracens); lending another's goods; selling above intrinsic value; speculation and buying cheap and selling dear; taking advantage of the poor and needy. Robert of Brunne's *Handlyng Synne* (ll. 2389-2472)[5] describes many types of usury, but not in a systematic way; the same is true of John Myrc's Middle English *Instructions for Parish Priests*.[6] But it is not the aim of this paper to canvass the surviving corpus of Middle English literature for instances of attacks on the vice of usury; the aim is to present an unusual poem which properly sees economic conduct in relation to the salvation of men's souls. The popular mediaeval exemplum of the penitent usurer[7] testifies to the continual problems which the priesthood was forced to confront during the mediaeval period in its unremitting warfare against the detested sin of avarice.

(The transcriptions which follow silently expand obvious abbreviations and introduce modern capitalization and punctuation. The manuscripts are reproduced herewith through the permission of the authorities of the British Museum.)

I

Ms Harley 45 *De Vsura* (fol. 63^v)

primus modus Oker scheweþ hym in many maneres. The firste manere is when a man leneþ and takiþ for his lone by couenant made byfore. Þis is oker open wiþoute curtesie and þis byhoueþ byȝolde aȝen or to be dampned þerfore in hell.

ij modus Þe secounde manere is when a man leneþ of his fre will to anoþer wipoute forward of wynnyng but neuerþeles þe borwer ȝeueþ hym som what for his lenynge and he takiþ hit. Þis lener is more curteys þen is þat other and ȝit he doþ oker but if he stoppe in þe ȝeyne payement of þe dette as moche as he took. For a man schulde lene to an other and ese him onliche for Goddes loue and þen perforce God wole ȝeue him endeles mede.

---

[8] See Sir Edmund Maunde Thompson, *A Catalogue of the Library of the Cathedral Church of Salisbury* (London, 1880), p. 21.

[4] See *EETS OS* No. 23, pp. 34-37; *EETS OS* No. 217, pp. 30-33.

[5] See *EETS OS* No. 119, pp. 85-88.

[6] See *EETS OS* No. 31, pp. 12, 22, 39.

[7] See Mary E. Barnicle, "The Exemplum of the Penitent Usurer," *PMLA XXXIII* (1918), 409-428; Brunne (*op. cit.*) pp. 183-192. For accounts of historical instances, see Hilary Jenkinson, "William Cade," *EHR*, XXVIII (1913), 209 ff.; *Historical MSS Commission* LXII (London, 1905), p. 27, for an account of Dame Juetta of Norfolk who was presented at Blicking Hall, Norfolk, manor court session of the Feast of St. Peter, 7 Edward II. For London rulings, see *Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis* I, ed. H. T. Riley (London, 1859), pp. 394-399.

iij modus The þridde manere of oker is when a man haþ good or catel, or londe or rente whiche þat he wote wel þat his forfadres or eldres wonnen wiþ oker. But he restore it to hem þat so loste it, he is as fer forth in perile or ferþer as þei þat wonne it.

iiij modus The ferþe manere of oker is when a man haþ a seruant þat wynneþ him good with oker, and he wot it and takiþ hit. For þen he may be cleped a maister okerer.

v modus The fifte maner of oker is when a man leneþ siluer or other money þat he haþ to kepe of oþer mennes and takiþ oughte to himself for the lenynge or boroweþ money for oker. And he þus may be cleped a disciple okerer.

vj modus The sixte manere of oker is when a man silleþ corn, beste or oþer catel and leneþ it to þe bigger to a certeyne day & sulleþ it þe derrer for þat lone and noght alloweþ it in þe payement.

vij modus The seuenþe manere of oker is when a man seeth þat an oþer moste nede haue þing þat he haþ to sille, and silleþ it at þe hyer pryse bycause of þe nede. Þen he wolde doo if he wiste þat þe bigger myght wel forbere it. And in þis he brekip þe lawe of kynde and charite, for he doth noght to his brother as he wolde his broþer did to him; ne he ne loueþ noght his broþer as him self.

viij modus The eighte manere of oker is when a man haþ nede to sille corne or it be rype to þresshe, or eny oþer catel or it were tyme to be sold, and þe bigger seeþ wel þat þe siller mote selle for nede of money and bieþ þanne at light pryse and payeþ byfore and abide þe delyuerance of corne or oþer catel til a certen day. At whiche he supposeþ wel hit schal be of moche more value þan he boght it. And if so falle þat þe corne or þe catel at þat tyme þat it schal be paide is moche more worth þat it was boght to, and þe bigger rewardeþ noght þe siller of þe surpluys, he doþ oker.

ix modus Þe nynthe maner of oker is when a man takeþ lond or rente in wed or surete for money or oþer good þat he leneþ to a certeyn day. And takiþ þe profite of þe londe or rente in þe mene tyme wiþoute alowance or abatement in þe payment of þe dette.

x modus Þe tenþe manere of oker is whan a man leneþ mone or oþer good vpon a wed of catel moeble to a certeyn day, and for he is noght payed at þe day, wiþholdiþ þe wed for euere. For it is more worth þan þe lone. For all þeigh couenant be þat: but ȝif he paye at his day, he schal holde þe wed as his. Ȝit ȝif þe wed be more worth þan þe dette he oweþ to restore þe surpluys. Or if a man wereþ or enpeyreþ þe wed þat is leide him for dette, he mote allowe and abate in þe payement as moch as þe wed is enpeyred by him or ellis he synneþ moker.

xi modus Þe enleuenþe manere of oker is þis: whan a man leneþ money to a marchaunt by couenant to haue it aȝen hole at alle periles and half þe wynnynge þat may come þerof and noght allowe of þe lostes þat may befalle. And in þe same wise it is in þe lenynge of bestes or eny oþer catell: to haue þe bestes or catel aʒen or þe veray prise wiþ half þat may come þerof wiþoute allowance of costs or lostes.

xii modus Þe twelfþe manere of oker is when a man leneþ money to a pore man to serue him bodiliche for þe lone; and if he may not paye him at þe daye, he byndeþ him and makiþ him doo more werk þan þe dette is worth. And in þese twelue maneres men synneþ in oker.

II

Ms Egerton 2810 *De Terminis Vsure* (fol. 180^{r})

Okure þrowe crafte of okerrers[1]
Schewis hit on mony maners.
[i] Þe firste manere is qwen a mon firstys[2] his þinge[3]
And takys oghte fore þe fyrstynge
Throgh couenande before þat men mas.[4]
Alle is okyr þat men so tas.[5]
Þis may be holdyn comynly okyr,
Okyr witowten curtasy.[6]
And þat behovys hym ʒelde agayn
Ore ellys he schalle hafe helle payne.[7]

[ii] Other manere of okure is
Þat is þis, bote it is les.
As a mon of his wylle fre
Lene syluer, golde & mone
And takys oghte fore þe fyrstynge
Of curtasy witowten hetynge.[8]
Ʒete is þat okure as men says
Bute he þat tas is curtas
Þat behoues hym stope[9] in þe dette,
Ore elles wrathe of God schalle he gete.
Fore iche man schuld fore Goddes sake
To oþer firste and noghte þerfore take,
Þen wylle God fore þat dede
Specialy graunte hym his mede.

[iii] Þe thride maner of okure kyde[10]
Is þis þat is myculle here hyde.
Als qwen a mon ʒeldes a þing
Þat his frendes wan here in okerrynge
And þai be passed oute of þis lyue
Be hit fader, moder ore wyfe.
He schuld note halde hit in store.
Bote he wolde make asethe[11] before,
Þat is to say if he wete
How his frendes hade wonnen hite,
And if[12] he do he is gylty
Als he þat dyde fyrste þe foly.

[iv] Þe furthe maner is chargande;[13]
Þat if þis to vnderstonde:
Als quen a mon a servande hase
Þat okure to his vse tas.
Ʒif he þerof payed hym halde
He may be maister okurrer calde.

---

[1] Cf. Brunne, *Handlyng Synne*, *EETS OS* No. 119, l. 2465: Okeryng ys on many manere,/Mo þan I kan telle now here.

[2] *firstys*, vb., properly *frist*, "to loan, advance credit." The scribal form throughout may represent a metathesis.

[3] *þinge*, sb., "property, substance."

[4] *mas*, vb., "makes."

[5] *tas*, vb., "takes."

[6] *curtasy*, sb., "good will" as distinguished from inherent or legal right (Du Cange: courtagium=munus proxenetae).

[7] Lines 3-10 desribe the commonest type of usury: cf. John Myrc *Instructions for Parish Priests* (*EETS OS* No. 31), ll. 379-381: For welle he wot þat oker hyt ys,/And lene xij d. to haue xiij/For þat is vsure wyþowte wene./According to the *Coventry Leet Book* (*EETS OS* No. 138), usury was proclaimed as heinous a sin as fornication (p. 544) at the leet of St. Dionysius (8 Henry VII).

[8] *hetynge*, sb., "pledge, vow."

[9] *stope*, vb., "reduce". See *OED s.v.* "stoop" v^{1}, 9.

[10] *kyde*, adj., "notorious" (pp. of kithe).

[11] *asethe*, sb., "restitution, compensation."

[12] *if*="unless."

[13] *chargande*, vb., "entrusting, putting the servant in charge."

[v] Þe fyfte maner of okure is þis,
Þat sume usys þat lyves mys,[14]
Alse quen a mon okure lenes
Þat syluer þat is oþer mennes
Þat in kepynge hase to safe
Wit þat þus wylle he okure hafe.
Ore if he be borw in privete
Fore okure, syluer ore mone
To lene to oþer and to hafe
More okure þen he þerfore gafe.
He þat is disciple of okerrere
Þat maner schall he by[15] fulle dere.
Bote he þerfore amendes make
Ere þe dethe hym hethe[r][16] take.

[vi] Þe sexte is þis quen a mon sellys
Corne ore beste ore oght elles,
And fyrstes hit to a certayn day
And sellys þe derrer for fyrst of pay.
In þe dette if he do wele
He schulde alow hit ilke a dele
Þat he hase more, I vnderstonde,
Þen he wolde fyrste take in honde.
Ande bote he do he mon be schente
Wen he of þis wor[l]d[17] is wente.

[vii] Þe sevend maner of okure soghte
Is þis, þat sume men chargen nozte
Þat wen a mon selles a þinge, nomly
To hym þat nede hase hit to by.
Fore he sees wele & cone wete
Þat he þat byes may note tary hit
Then selles he hit fore dowbyl prise.[18]
He tas ouer mykel on þat wise.
No more he schuld take of hym þan
Þen hit were worthy to anoþer man.
Fore þat he tase more
Þen þe worthe, hym schalle rew sore.
Fore on þat wise dose he noghte
Als he wold to hym were wrozte.
Þerfore schalle he aresued[19] be
Fore he dose agayn charite.

[viii] Þe aghted maner of þis is to drede:
Wen a mon sees anoþer man hafe nede
To selle corne, catelle ore fee
Before þe tyme þat selle to be.
(fol. 181^{r})
Þen byes he hit for a lytulle prise
To his awauntage on þis wise
So þat he make before þe pay,
And þe corne abyde to a day;
Fore he hase no doute þat ne þo corne schalle be
More worthe ate þe day þen firste gafe he;
So may þe corne be solde and boghte
Þat þe byere schalle hafe for noghte.
For ate þe day may falle so
Þat þe corne is worthe syche tow.[20]
Þerefore he schulde quen he hit tas
Pay hym more alse þe corne þen gas.[21]
And if he rewarde hym wit no more
Þen tas he okure, ase I sayde ore.

[ix] Þe neghed maner of okure I fynde
Þat mas some mens conciens blynde,
Þat is quene a mon fore a vauntage
Lenes syluer for rente in morgage,
And þe profete of þe rente
Ouer þe syluer þat is lente
Of alle þe tyme to þe day
Þat is sete to make þe pay.
Bote he þe profete to prise sete

---

[14] *mys*, adj., aphetic for "amiss."
[15] *by*, vb., "redeem."
[16] *Ms* hethen.
[17] *Ms* word.
[18] Cf. Myrc, *ed. cit.*, ll. 376-378: God taketh myche on gref/To selle a mon in hys myschef/Any þynge to hye prys.
[19] *aresued*, vb., "to shake violently."
[20] *tow*, sb. "two", hence "double." This sense not found in the *OED; cf. Ms Harley* 45: muche more worth; *Jacob's Well*: myche derrere.
[21] *gas*, vb., "goes", i.e., "is worth on the open market."

And alow hit in þo dette,[22]
His saule schalle be in grete daunchere
Als he þat is an okurrere·

[x] Þe tente maner of okure may be
In þis cas þat may men ofte se:
Ase quen a mon withaldes fore ay
A wed þat layde is to a day.
Fore he hase note þe pay of þe dette,
Nomly ate þe day pat is sete.
Alle if þe couenand suche ware,
Ȝete if þe wedde were worthy mare
Þan þe dette amounte mighte,
Hym behouyd ȝylde agayn þrogh ryghte,
Ore elles he schale hafe an hard fyte
Qwens he schalle out of þis world flytte.
Ore if a mon þe wed it layde
Were ay tylle þe dette be payd
If hit be pay rede, as I trow,
In þe pay hym behoues alow
And stop[22a] als mycull and no lesse
Als þe wed þen apayred[23] is.
And bote he do, I warne hym wele,
He mone þerfore hard payne felle.

[xi] Þe ellend maner fynde I now,[24]
Þat is þis, I dar avow.
Qyen a mon tase tylle[25] a marchand
Syluer or gold be þis couenande
Þat he hafe half þat wynnyng is
And his awne syluer; neuer þe les
If he take half wynnyng fre
Witouten oker may þat not be
Fore he wille hafe half wynnynge
And noȝt alow if þer be tynnynge.[26]
Bote if he make first sych couand
Þat he to perell of lose wyl stond,
And alow ase falles costage,[27]
Þen may he take half a vauntage
Lefully as couenand wylle
Witouten okure, & þat is skylle.[28]
Ande þe same maner in catel lys
Þat to halfe is lettyd on þis wise:
Quen a mon letis catell or fe
To half in suche a couenand be
Þat he half þe vauntage hafe
Þat þerof comys, and his owne safe,
So if þat catelle be loste
He wille hafe holy þat his coste
Ne ȝete alow no costage,
Þat hald I okure al his auauntage.

[xii] Þe xii maner of okur is ille—
Þat is þis þat sume men vse wylle:
Als quen a mon wille firste or lene
Syluer ore corne to symple men
Ore oþer þinge þat myȝt þaim availe.
Þen puttes he þaim to travayle
In his werkis þat he wolde were wroȝte
And elles wille he first þaim noȝte.
Ore if þai may note þe dette pay
Als þai are halden ate þe day
Þen mase he wit þaim couande
To wirke his werkes wit fote & honde
Fore þat dete þat þai hym owe
And þerto byndes hom wit þe law.
He wylle fore ilk peny of dett
Þre penyworth of work sette.
Þis is a synfulle bargayn,
Þerfore he schalle hafe mycul payn.
Now haf I scheud ȝow on sere w[ise][29]
Þe cawsis in quych okure lyes.

......

R. H. Bowers
University of Florida.

---

[22] Lines 109-110, construe: "unless he allows for the profit and deducts it from the repayment. . ."

[22a] Cf. *supra*, note 9.

[23] *apayred*, vb., "injured" hence "deteriorated."

[24] The contract or agreement described as type xi was known as *societas*.

[25] *tas tylle*="takes to."

[26] *tynnynge*, sb., "loss. damage."

[27] Construe: "And allow for what overhead befalls. . ."

[28] *skylle*, sb., "cause, reason."

[29] *Ms* illegible after letter *w*.

VI. Boetius of Dacia and the Double Truth.

UP TO the present the only known works of Boetius of Dacia[1] were logical treatises, two *opuscula*: *De Summo bono sive de vita philosophi* and *De Sompniis*, and a fragment of a commentary on the *Meteors*.[2] He was known to have written other works, including one on the eternity of the world, but all of these were lost. This was regrettable, for Boetius played an important role in the conflict of ideas at Paris at the end of the thirteenth century. Contemporary documents link him with Siger of Brabant as a leader of the rationalist movement which challenged the deepest convictions of the Middle Ages on the harmony of faith and reason and provoked such a vehement reaction on the part of the theologians. One of the manuscripts of the celebrated condemnation of the movement in 1277 by Stephen Tempier, the Bishop of Paris, claims that it was directed "against the heretics, Siger and Boetius."[3] One of the oldest manuscripts goes so far as to say that Boetius was "the principal exponent" of the propositions condemned by the Bishop.[4] A catalogue of the works of Raymond Lull states that Lull's treatise on the condemned propositions is directed against "the errors of Boetius and Siger."[5] And history still links the names of Siger and Boetius after their condemnation: they are said to have left France together and to have taken refuge in Italy at the Papal court.[6]

It was evident from the works of Boetius already edited that he did in fact hold ideas consonant with the condemned movement in philosophy. His remarkable little treatise *De Summo bono* extols the philosophical life as the best possible to man. It is true that its author does not deny a future beatitude assured to us by faith. But he takes obvious delight in describing the happiness of the pursuit of wisdom in the natural order, and he does not hesitate to locate our ultimate end and supreme good in that order.[7] The ideas in this treatise have not always been interpreted in the same way; but at least it seems clear that its author was a man passionately devoted to the rational pursuit of knowledge, and that he poorly reconciled his rationalism with his faith.[8]

In view of the importance of Boetius of Dacia in mediaeval thought and the difficulty of interpreting correctly his attitude towards faith and reason in his extant works, historians will welcome the recent discovery of his treatise *De Mundi aeternitate* by Géza Sajó in a manuscript of the National Library of Budapest. Mr. Sajó has edited the treatise with a scholarly introduction.[9] The treatise is anonymous, but the editor has argued convincingly that it is an authentic work of Boetius of Dacia.[10]

---

[1] Born in Sweden, Boetius received the name *de Dacia* because he was a Dominican living in the Province of Dacia, which included both Sweden and Denmark. Cf. E. Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1955), p. 725, note 34.

[2] On the works of Boetius of Dacia, cf. M. Grabmann, *Neu aufgefundene Werke des Siger von Brabant und Boetius von Dacien* (Munich, 1924). The *opuscula De Summo bono* and *De Sompniis* have been edited by M. Grabmann, *Archives d'hist. doct. et litt. du moyen âge*, VI (1931), 287-317; *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben* II (Munich, 1936), pp. 200-224. Another manuscript of the *De Summo bono*, not listed by M. Grabmann, is in the Newberry Library, Chicago, *Ms* +23 (Ry 30) (J 280), fols. 173b-175.

[3] *Chartularium Univ. Paris.* I (Paris, 1889), p. 556.

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 558, note 100.

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 556.

[6] Cf. E. Gilson, *op. cit.*, p. 399.

[7] Cf. *De Summo bono;* ed. M. Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geist.* II, pp. 212-213.

[8] On the various interpretations of this work, cf. E. Gilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 400-401.

[9] Géza Sajó, *Un traité récemment découvert de Boèce de Dacie* De mundi aeternitate. *Texte inédit avec une introduction critique, avec en appendice un texte inédit de Siger de Brabant* Super VI° Metaphysicae (Budapest, 1954).

[10] *Op. cit.*, pp. 49-63. The same cannot be said of the editor's attribution to Siger of Brabant of the anonymous Question *Utrum omnia eveniant de necessitate*, found in the same Budapest codex and edited in the appendix, pp. 123-135. The Question is described, pp. 39-43. The similarity of doctrine in this Question and Siger's *De necessitate et contingentia causarum* renders it possible that Siger was its author, but not beyond all doubt. This Question should be compared with the Question on the same subject contained in *Ms* Peterhouse 152, which almost certainly is Siger's. Cf. A. Maurer, "Siger of Brabant's *De Necessitate*

The publication of Boetius' *De Mundi aeternitate* makes it more evident why he has been named, along with Siger of Brabant, as the target of the condemnation of 1277. Two of the censured propositions reflect the teaching of his *De Summo bono*: *Quod non est excellentior status, quam vacare philosophiae*; *Quod sapientes mundi sunt philosophi tantum.*[11] Thanks to Mr. Sajó we now know that Boetius upheld six other condemned propositions in his *De Mundi aeternitate*:

(1) Quod nulla questio est disputabilis per rationem, quam philosophus non debeat disputare et determinare, quia rationes accipiuntur a rebus. Philosophia autem omnes res habet considerare secundum diversas sui partes (*Chart.* n. 145; Boetius, lines 353-372).[12]
(2) Quod creatio non est possibilis, quamvis contrarium tenendum sit secundum fidem (*Chart.* n. 184; Boetius, lines 449-460).
(3) Quod non fuit primus homo, nec erit ultimus, immo semper fuit et semper erit generatio hominis ex homine (*Chart.* n. 9, Boetius, lines 461-466.
(4) Quod non contingit corpus corruptum redire idem numero, nec idem numero resurget (*Chart.* n. 17, Boetius, lines 503-513).
(5) Quod resurrectio futura non debet concedi a philosopho, quia impossibile est eam investigare per rationem. (*Chart.* n. 18, Boetius, lines 509-512; 945-947).
(6) Quod naturalis philosophus debet negare simpliciter mundi novitatem, quia innititur causis naturalibus et rationibus naturalibus. Fidelis autem potest negare mundi eternitatem, quia innititur causis supernaturalibus (*Chart.* n. 90; Boetius, lines 538-547; 549-554).

This is enough to make the newly edited treatise of Boetius of Dacia an important historical document. But there is more to be added. The editor tells us that it contains a detailed exposition of the celebrated doctrine of the "double truth"—indeed, that it was precisely Boetius of Dacia who established this doctrine in the sense in which it was stated in the decree of condemnation.[13] The prologue of Tempier's decree refers to some members of the Faculty of Arts at Paris who went beyond the limits of their Faculty and presumed to teach as true, doctrines in philosophy contrary to the faith. "For they say they are true according to philosophy, but not according to the Catholic faith, as if there were two contrary truths, and as if truth in the sayings of the accursed pagans were contrary to the truth of Sacred Scripture."[14]

Up to the present, the editor tells us, we did not possess any original Averroist work of the thirteenth century enunciating the conception of a double truth. This led certain historians to deny its existence. E. Gilson, for example, affirms that no one ever upheld the doctrine; it was the adversaries of Siger and the other Averroists who imposed it upon them as a necessary consequence of their attitude. These philosophers never taught that there are two simultaneous and contradictory truths. Whenever the teaching of philosophy is opposed to that of faith, they always assert that truth is on the side of faith, even though the contrary follows necessarily from the principles of philosophy.[15] The editor quotes

---

et Contingentia Causarum and *Ms* Peterhouse 152", *Mediaeval Studies*, XIV (1952), 48-60. It is also edited in J. J. Duin, *La doctrine de la providence dans les écrits de Siger de Brabant* (Louvain, 1954), pp. 100-111.

[11] Cf. *De Summo bono; ed. cit.*, p. 213. Cf. *Chartularium Univ. Paris.* I (Paris, 1889), p. 545, n. 40; p. 552, n. 154. Cf. G. Sajó, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

[12] References are to the condemned propositions in the *Chartularium*, pp. 544 ff, and to Boetius' *De Mundi aeternitate, ed. cit.* Cf. G. Sajó, *op. cit.*, pp. 50-51; 74-75.

[13] Cf. G. Sajó, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

[14] Dicunt enim ea esse vera secundum philosophiam, sed non secundum fidem catholicam, quasi sint due contrarie veritates, et quasi contra veritatem sacre scripture sit veritas in dictis gentilium dampnatorum. *Chartularium Univ. Paris.* I (Paris, 1889), p. 543. Cf. G. Sajó, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

[15] Cf. G. Sajó, *op. cit.*, p. 36. Cf. E. Gilson, "La doctrine de la double vérité", *Etudes*

F. Sassen and F. Van Steenberghen as in agreement with E. Gilson on this point.[16]

According to Mr. Sajó, the discovery of the *De Mundi aeternitate* makes this thesis untenable, for it reveals that Boetius taught the doctrine of the double truth precisely as it was stated in the decree of condemnation.[17]

The issue raised by Mr. Sajó is so important that it merits serious consideration. If what he says is true, it would be necessary to revise the current view of the conflict of faith and reason in the thirteenth century. In the opinion of the present writer, however, the discovery of Boetius' treatise requires us to make no such essential revision. The position on faith and reason adopted by Boetius appears to be in all essentials the same as that of Siger of Brabant and the other Averroists. Put in bolder form than theirs, it comes closest to the condemned proposition, but it is not identical with it. This will become clear if we review the main theses of Boetius' *De Mundi aeternitate.*

Boetius begins by stating his purpose in writing the treatise: his intention is to reconcile the teaching of faith and Aristotle concerning the eternity of the world. He is convinced that they are in agreement on this point and that only the ignorant will deny this. In order to appreciate how they are to be reconciled, certain methodological principles must be understood. First of all, faith rests for the most part upon miracles and not upon reasoning. Indeed, what is held as a conclusion of reason is no longer faith but science (27-28).[18] According to Aristotle the teachings of religion necessarily do not admit of demonstrative proof (18-19). So there are two errors equally to be avoided: (1) To attempt to demonstrate something held by faith which is indemonstrable by its very nature. (2) To lapse into heresy by refusing to believe a doctrine of faith on the ground that it does not admit of demonstration (13-17). Turning now to philosophy, Boetius asserts that when the philosophers concern themselves with changeable things their opinions do not rest upon demonstrations and certain arguments (23-25). If these principles are kept in mind, Boetius concludes, it will be seen that philosophy and faith do not contradict each other regarding the eternity of the world, and that the arguments of heretics holding the eternity of the world against the Catholic faith do not have any force (28-33).

It is apparent from this that Boetius does not side with the heretics on the eternity of the world, nor does he have unbounded confidence in the philosophers' ability to settle the question once and for all. He does defend, however, with a good deal of vigor, the right of the philosopher to handle the problem. The philosopher, he asserts, teaches the nature of all things, because his subject-matter is being. The various branches of philosophy consider the parts of being. So it is the duty of the philosopher to deal with all beings, natural, mathematical, and divine, insofar as they are knowable through human reason and argumentation. The philosopher, then, must have the duty of settling every question which is disputable through reason. If anyone denies this he just does not know what he is saying (354-372).

Boetius' insistence on this point and his rather acrimonious terms in defending himself are understandable if we remember the dispute in which he was engaged. Opponents, like St. Bonaventure, denied philosophers the right to enter such daring inquiries as whether the world is eternal. St. Bonaventure thought the

---

de philosophie médiévale (Strasbourg, 1921), 59-69. Prof. Gilson's latest remarks on this subject will be found in his *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1955), pp. 398-399, 522-524.

[16] Cf. F. Sassen, "Siger de Brabant et la doctrine de la double vérité", *Revue néo-scolastique de philosophie* 33 (1931), 170-179; F. Van Steenberghen, *Siger de Brabant d'après ses oeuvres inédites* II (Louvain, 1942), p. 688. F. Van Steenberghen's latest comments on this subject are in: *Le mouvement doctrinal du XIe au XIVe siècle (Histoire de l'Eglise* XIII [Paris, 1951]), pp. 275-277.

[17] Cf. G. Sajó, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

[18] References to the *De Mundi aeternitate* will be given according to the lineation of the edition.

current errors in philosophy came precisely from such bold venturing into realms better left to faith and theology.[19] In 1272 a decree of the Parisian Faculty of Arts forbad philosophers to discuss purely theological matters and to lecture on texts containing anything contrary to faith. They were told to label them simply erroneous and pass on to other matters.[20] Obviously this decree was not well observed, for in 1277 Stephen Tempier saw it necessary to condemn the notion that the philosopher has the right to dispute and settle all matters which can be treated on a rational basis. The fact that this condemned proposition is found almost literally in Boetius' *De Mundi aeternitate* is a sure sign that he was one of those who failed to comply with his Faculty's decree.[21]

If we grant Boetius that the philosopher has the right to discuss the question of the eternity of the world, the next problem is, what can the philosopher tell us about it? Boetius gives in turn the answer of the philosopher of nature, the mathematician, and the metaphysician. Since he disposes of the last two quite briefly, let us see what they have to say on the matter before we turn to the philosopher of nature, whose position is the most crucial of all.

The metaphysician knows the world depends on the divine will as on its sufficient cause. In order, therefore, to demonstrate that the world is co-eternal with God or that it had a temporal beginning, it would be necessary to know the eternal will of God. And where would the metaphysician find a demonstration perfectly revealing that will? If any metaphysician claimed to have such a demonstration, it would not only be make-believe but a kind of insanity. Boetius concludes that the metaphysician can neither prove the world is eternal nor had a beginning in time (606-626).

The same is true of the mathematician, but for another reason. The mathematician is either an astrologer, concerned with the movements of the stars or their effects on the lower world, or else he is a geometrician, arithmetician, or musician. In every case his science is exactly the same whether the world is eternal or not. He remains indifferent to the problem, for his conclusions are equally true in either case (559-605).

It is quite different with the philosopher of nature. Two principles must be kept in mind when discussing the eternity of the world from his point of view. First, no scientist can concede or deny anything except on the basis of the principles of his science. Secondly, *nature* is the first principle of natural science; so all explanations in this science must ultimately refer to it. Now nature cannot cause any new movement unless there is another preceding it as its cause. It follows that the philosopher of nature can never affirm, according to his principles, that there was a first movement, for such a movement would not be preceded by any other (376-400).

We come to the same conclusion if we consider that every new beginning in a natural effect presupposes some new beginning in its immediate principles. This requires that there be a change in the being preceding it. In brief, nature cannot cause a new movement or effect without a preceding change. If we follow the principles of natural philosophy, then, we cannot say that there was a first original movement (401-429).

From this it is clear that the philosopher of nature cannot assert, on the basis of his principles, that the world began in time, for then movement would have begun in time. Neither can he affirm anything about creation, that is, the production of the world in its very being. His first principle is nature, and nature produces all its effects from matter as from a subject. The proper term for this is generation, not creation, and it is the only mode of production taught in natural philosophy. It follows that the natural scientist cannot affirm the existence of a first man, for by definition he would not be produced by generation. Neither can he know that a dead man will come back to life without being generated, or that numerically the same person who before was corruptible will be incorruptible in an after-life. These are all truths of the Christian faith, Boethius says, but they are truths unknown to the philosopher of nature. Nor should we be surprised at this, for every scientist cannot know every truth (444-473).

---

[19] Ex improbo ausu investigationis philosophicae procedunt errores in philosophis, sicut est ponere mundum aeternum. St. Bonaventure, *De Decem praeceptis*, Collatio II, n. 25; *Opera Omnia* V (Quaracchi, 1891), p. 514.

[20] *Chartularium Univ. Paris.* I, pp. 499-500.

[21] *Chartularium Univ. Paris.* I, p. 551, n. 145. Cf. G. Sajó, *op. cit.*, pp. 50-51.

If that is so, it would seem that the philosopher of nature should be content to refrain from either affirming or denying anything about the truths of faith, such as the non-eternity of the world. If someone says that these truths are known, not by reason, but by a revelation made by a higher being, it would seem that he should not deny them, for strictly speaking his principles do not extend to them (474-494).

Boetius points out that the matter is not as simple as this. A natural scientist should not deny any truth to which his principles do not extend *which does not contradict his principles or destroy his science*. But he ought to deny a truth contrary to his principles and destructive of his science. Now this is precisely the case with the truths of Christian faith with which we have been concerned. He is bound not simply to ignore them, but to deny them. In such a case, the conclusion of the natural scientist is absolutely speaking false; yet it follows from the principles of his science (495-535; 848-850).

How then are philosophy and faith reconcilable? Boetius uses an example to explain how this is possible. If someone says Socrates is white, and someone else denies that in some respect he is white, both speak the truth (*uterque dicit verum*). So too the Christian speaks the truth when he says that the world and movement had a beginning in time, that there was a first man, etc., for this is possible through the power of a cause greater than nature. The philosopher of nature also speaks the truth when he says this is not possible from natural causes and principles, which properly delimit the range of his knowledge (538-547).

The Christian and the philosopher of nature are thus in no way in contradiction. The philosopher of nature limits himself to the truths of natural causes and says, on their basis, that the world and motion had no beginning; the Christian, knowing a cause higher than nature, asserts on its basis that the world can have a beginning.[22] Their different viewpoints and principles thus ensure their never meeting exactly on the same ground and hence the impossibility of their ever contradicting one another.

Such in all essentials is Boetius' reconciliation of philosophy with faith on the question of the eternity of the world. It must be admitted that his solution to the problem was not likely to be popular with either philosophers or theologians. The philosopher would hardly be pleased to hear that a conclusion which he draws in all strictness from his principles is absolutely speaking false. Neither would the theologian be pleased to hear that something he knows to be true can legitimately be denied by the philosopher. To him this would amount to saying that a truth in the order of faith is contradictory to one in the order of philosophy; in brief, that anyone who talks like this is speaking as though there were two contrary truths.

This was precisely the conclusion Stephen Tempier drew and which he condemned in 1277. It is to be noticed, however, that it is a conclusion, and not exactly what Boetius has said. He does speak of two truths: the statement of the Christian that the world is not eternal, and the statement of the philosopher that this is impossible according to natural principles (538-545). So both the Christian and the philosopher speak the truth: *uterque dicit verum.* But these truths are not in opposition; they are, on the contrary, perfectly reconcilable. For there to be contrary truths, the Christian truth that the world is not eternal would have to be opposed to a philosophical truth that the world is eternal. But we look in vain in Boetius' treatise for the statement that the eternity of the world is philosophically true. We are told simply that it follows from the principles of natural philosophy. In one place Boetius asserts that it follows from the "truths of natural causes"; but the conclusion itself is not explicitly said to be true.[23] Boetius comes so close to affirming a two-fold truth at this point, and yet avoids it so adroitly, that we can only conclude that he did so deliberately. Like Siger of Brabant, he appears to be very careful not to bring faith and philosophy into open contradiction in the realm of truth. And yet he comes so close to it that we can readily see why he was condemned by the Bishop of Paris. It does not seem exact to say, however, as the editor of the treatise does, that Boetius "speaks here of *two opposed* but *at the same time reconcilable truths.*"[24]

---

[22] Et quia naturalis solum considerat veritates causarum naturalium, dicit mundum et motum primum non esse novum, ex his autem fides christiana, considerans causam superiorem quam sit natura, dixit mundum posse esse novum ex illa, ideo non contradicunt in aliquo. Lines 549-554. Although the sentence is defective, this seems to be its meaning.

In all essentials Boetius' views on the eternity of the world are very close to those of Siger of Brabant's. Both consider the philosopher incapable of giving a strict demonstration of the world's eternity. According to Boetius, the philosopher cannot show by human reason that movement and the world are eternal or not eternal. The problem remains a dialectical one, with both sides supported by probable arguments.[25] Siger also was not too confident in reason's ability to settle the issue. Reflecting on the little knowledge we have of God, and the possibility of erring with regard to Him and His relations with creatures, he concludes that the statement of the world's eternity is not necessary but probable.[26]

But that is not the whole story. If they had limited themselves to this, their position would have been identical with that of St. Thomas Aquinas, and it would hardly have been a subject of condemnation.[27] In fact they went much further. Although Boetius asserts that neither the philosopher of nature, the mathematician, nor the metaphysician can demonstrate the eternity of the world, the position in which he places the philosopher of nature is strikingly different from that of the other two. The mathematician is indifferent to the problem, and the metaphysician finds it difficult to solve because he knows the answer depends on the inscrutable will of God. The philosopher of nature, on the other hand, proceeding from nature as from a principle, finds it necessary to conclude to the eternity of the world: *conclusio in qua naturalis dicit mundum et primum motum non esse novum . . . si referatur in rationes et principia ex quibus ipse eam concludit, ex illis sequitur* (532-535). He is thus placed in the anomalous position of having to deny something he believes on faith to be true (503-513). Siger of Brabant would force the same indignity upon the human reason, for he too suggests that human reason comes to conclusions which must be denied: *ratio humana ducit in hoc quod debet negari.*[28]

---

[23] *Ibid.*

[24] Cf. G. Sajó, *op. cit.*, p. 73. (Editor's italics).

[25] . . . ergo per nullam humanam rationem potuit (*scil.* philosophus) ostendi motus primus et mundus esse novus, nec etiam potest ostendi quod sit aeternus; quia qui hoc demonstraret, debet demonstrare formam voluntatis divinae. Et quis eam investigabit? Ideo dicit Aristoteles, in libro *Topicorum* (I, 11, 104b1-8), quod aliquod est probabile de quo neutro modo opinamur, ut utrum mundus sit aeternus vel non. Lines 635-642.

[26] Cum ergo tu dicis: si causa est ab aeterno unde debet esse effectus, tunc effectus erit ab aeterno, tu consideras ad ista inferiora et non respicis ad Primum, quod est alterius rationis. Sic ergo potest aliquis errare, et sic propositio assumpta probabilis est et non necessaria. Siger of Brabant, *Questions sur la métaphysique* III, 19; éd. C. Graiff (Louvain, 1948), p. 155, lines 34-38.

[27] Cf. St. Thomas, *Summa Theologiae* I, 46, 1.

[28] Siger of Brabant, *loc. cit.*, line 22.

In his *De Mundi aeternitate*, as in his *De Summo bono*, Boetius extols the life of the philosophers "who were and are the wise men of the world."[29] He shows a deep feeling for the independence of rational thought and a strong conviction of its ultimate reconciliation with faith. But he conceives that reconciliation as a *separation* of faith and philosophy, the former resting on miracles and divine revelation, the latter upon human reason. There is no intimate connection and harmony between them as in the theology of St. Thomas Aquinas.

It was this dichotomy between faith and reason and the resultant tensions and contradictions between them in the thought of Boetius and Siger that aroused the opposition of the theologians. St. Thomas Aquinas saw clearly the disastrous consequences of their position for both reason and faith. He pointed out that if a conclusion of reason is necessary, it must be necessarily *true*. Hence it cannot contradict faith without implying that faith is in error.[30] Neither Boetius nor Siger would accept this consequence, however, for they avoided calling true a conclusion of reason contrary to faith. Stephen Tempier drew still another impossible conclusion from their words. If, as they claimed, the teachings of faith are true, and the conclusions of reason contradict them, then they talked as though there were two contradictory truths, one of faith and another of philosophy. These *reductiones ad absurdum* of the theologians struck indeed at the weakness of the position of Siger and Boetius, but they did not express exactly the state of the matter as they saw it. We knew that already in the case of Siger of Brabant. Now that we can read Boetius' *De Mundi aeternitate* we also know it to be true of him. No one has yet been found in the Middle Ages who held the doctrine of the double truth as it was condemned in 1277.[31]

---

[29] In the final paragraph Boetius expresses in a moving way his confidence in the value of philosophy and his indignation at those who would destroy it. Nec credas quod philosophus qui vitam suam posuit in studio sapientiae, contradixit veritati fidei catholicae in aliquo, sed magis studeas, quia modicum habes intellectum respectu philosophorum qui fuerunt et sunt sapientes mundi, ut possis intelligere sermones eorum. . . . Ideo christianus subtiliter intelligens non cogitur ex lege sua destruere principia philosophiae, sed salvat fidem et philosophiam, neutram corripiendo. Si autem aliquis in dignitate constitutus fuerit, et tam ardua non possit intelligere, tunc obaediat sapientiori et credat legi christianae . . . Lines 964-989.

[30] Ergo sentit quod fides sit de aliquibus quorum contraria de necessitate concludi possunt. Cum autem de necessitate concludi non possit nisi verum necessarium, cujus oppositum est falsum impossibile, sequitur secundum ejus dictum quod fides sit de falso impossibili quod etiam Deus facere non potest. . . . St. Thomas, *De Unitate intellectus* V; ed. Perrier, *Opuscula Omnia* I (Paris, 1949), p. 120.

[31] In a review of Boetius' *De Mundi aeternitate* S. Harrison Thomson agrees with the editor's claim that it contains the doctrine of the double truth. Cf. *Speculum*, XXX (1955), 680-681. According to him, Boetius admits no final truth. "*Veritas* becomes a term purely relative to the framework of the discipline in which one works." Cf. G. Sajó, pp. 73-74. However, Boetius not only fails to call a conclusion of philosophy contrary to faith true, but he calls it absolutely false (531-534). Hence he does have an absolute standard of truth, and that is faith.

ARMAND MAURER C.S.B.
Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.

The Letter of Heloise on Religious Life and Abelard's First Reply

J. T. MUCKLE C.S.B.

INTRODUCTION

I HAVE numbered these letters, V and VI. The text of the first four letters was published in *Mediaeval Studies,* (XV) 1953. I also included there the text of the introduction of the first of the letters which follow since it is of a personal character. In her letter Heloise sets forth with some digressions the incongruities of the Rule of St. Benedict when applied to women, and asks Abelard to compose an adaptation of that rule for nuns. She also asks Abelard to write for her and for her community a history of religious life of women. In letter VI[1] Abelard sets forth to answer the second request. In it he would trace religious life of women back to Apostolic times. He displays no knowledge of the rise of organized religious communities of women in the East in the fourth century. Abelard was a better dialectician than historian.

The manuscripts used for this edition are seven[2] of the nine employed for my edition of the '*Historia Calamitatum*' published in *Mediaeval Studies*, XII (1950), 163-213. They are:

T....Bibliothèque de Troyes, *Ms* 802, fols. 35^r-59^r.
A....Paris, Bibl. Nat. *Ms lat.* 2923, fols. 26^r-42^r.
B....Paris, Bibl. Nat. *Ms lat.* 2544, fols. 25^r-40^v.
R....Bibl. de Reims, *Ms* 872 (J751), fols. 137^v-157^r.
C....Paris, Bibl. Nat. *Ms nouv. acq. lat.* 1873, fols. 171^r-172^v, 184^r-188^v, 191^r-195^v, 183^{rv}, 173^r-176^v.
E....Paris, Bibl. Nat. *Ms lat.* 2545, fols. 27^r-40^r.
F....Paris, Bibl. Nat. *Ms nouv. acq. lat.* 13057, pp. 58-118.

For a description and an evaluation of these manuscripts together with a *stemma*, I refer the reader to the introduction of my edition of the *Historia Calamitatum* in *Mediaeval Studies*, XII (1950). There is a long lacuna (one folio) in *Ms A* at the end of fol. 37^v, from *Haec idcirco domina* on page 267 to *Ipse tuum cognosce* on p. 271. There are many lacunae, some long, in *Mss CEF*. I have indicated all these lacunae in my notes.

I have also used a fragment of Bibl. Nat. *Ms nouv. acq. fr.* 20,001 fols. 11^{rv}-12^v (one column only). This is a fragment of what was originally *Ms* 298 of Dijon. It contained all the letters between Abelard and Heloise. These two folios cover the last part of letter VI, beginning with the words: *caelibi se vitae dicarent* on page 276 of this text and end with the closing words of the introduction of letter VII, the *Regula sanctimonialium: Valete in Christo, sponsae Christi.* Then follows the following colophon: *expliciunt epistole Petri Abailardi et Heloyse, primitus eius amice, postmodum uxoris, scripte Parisius per me Matthiam*[3] *Rivalli in domo episcopi Ambianensi, anno domini millenario CCCLX° primo, mense decembri.* For the history and original contents of this manuscript, see *Bull. de la Société des anciens textes français* I (1875), pp. 44-49: *Romania, art. cit.,* 364-74. It is written in good fourteenth century script and belongs to the same family as *Mss B* and *R* above, though it does not give as good a text as either of them.

---

[1] A text of the *Regula sanctimonialium,* Abelard's second reply, edited by T. P. McLaughlin C.S.B., will be published in *Mediaeval Studies,* XVIII (1956).

[2] The other two do not contain these letters.

[3] For information about Mathias du Rivau, see *Romania,* XXXIV (1905), 368.

In the edition of this text I have given all the readings, even the corruptions, of *Ms* Troyes 802 but not unimportant inversions of word order, gemination of consonants and in general most other variations in spelling. I have done the same for *Ms* B.N. *lat.* 2923 except that I have not listed the corruptions. For the other manuscripts I have given only a few variants unsupported by another manuscript. To have listed all would have greatly increased the list of variants and would have served no useful purpose. I have changed the spelling to conform to modern usage, v.g.: e to ae or oe, cio to tio, etc. I have followed the Vulgate in the spelling of the verb *unguo* as *ungo*, but *unguentum*. These letters have been previously published by d'Amboise, Duchesne, Rawlinson, Cousin and Migne. For a criticism of these editions, see my Introduction *loc. cit.* 168-171.

SIGLA

A==Bibliothèque Nat., *Ms lat.* 2923.
B==Bibliothèque Nat., *Ms lat.* 2544.
C==Bibliothèque Nat., *Ms n. acq. lat.* 1873.
E==Bib. Nat., *Ms lat.* 2545.
F==Bib. Nat., *Ms n. acq. lat.* 13057.
Fv==*Ms* variants in F.
H==Bib. Nat., *Ms* n. acq. fr. 20,001.
R==Bib. de Reims, *Ms* 872.
T==Bib. de Troyes, *Ms* 802.
Amb==Edition of d'Amboise (1616).
G==Variants given by d'Amboise.
MGH==Monumenta Germaniae Historica.
CSEL==Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum.
PL==Migne, Patrologia Latina.

TEXT

V. (Item eadem ad eundem)[1]

Suo[2] specialiter, sua singulariter.

Ne me forte in aliquo de inobedientia causari queas, verbis etiam immoderati doloris tuae frenum impositum est iussionis[3] ut ab his mihi saltem in scribendo temperem a quibus in sermone non tam difficile quam impossibile est providere. Nihil[4] enim minus in nostra est potestate quam animus, eique magis obedire cogimur quam imperare possimus. Unde et cum nos eius affectiones stimulant, nemo earum subitos impulsus ita repulerit ut non in effecta facile[5] prorumpant, et se[6] per verba facilius effluant quae promptiores animi passionum sunt notae,[7] secundum quod scriptum est:[8] *Ex abundantia enim*[9] *cordis os loquitur.* Revocabo itaque manum a scripto in quibus linguam a verbis temperare non valeo. Utinam sic animus dolentis parere promptus sit quemadmodum dextra[10] scribentis.

Aliquod tamen dolori[11] remedium vales conferre si non hunc omnino possis

---

[1] *om. BCERT*] quae est eiusdem Heloissae ad eundem Petrum *Amb.*

[2] Domino *T Amb.* The *s* in *suo* is only partly done in illustration in *Ms B* and not put in in *Mss CE.*

[3] visionis *BR.*

[4] nihil . . . necessarium *om. CEF.*

[5] *om. BR.*

[6] *om. A.*

[7] The statement: verba sunt notae passionum, is common in Latin treatises on Logic. It goes back to Aristotle, *De Interpretatione* 1, which is translated by Boethius, *In Librum de interpretatione, Editio prima;* PL 64, 279A: sunt ergo quae in voce earum quae sunt in anima passionum notae.

[8] *Matt.* xii, 34.

[9] *om. Amb.*

[10] dextera *T Amb.*

[11] doloris *BR*] *om. T* but dolo in margin (*s.m.*).

auferre. Ut enim insertum clavum[12] alius expellit, sic cogitatio nova priorem excludit cum alias intentus animus priorum memoriam dimittere cogitur aut intermittere. Tanto vero amplius cogitatio quaelibet animum occupat, et ab[13] aliis deducit, quanto quod cogitatur honestius aestimatur, et quo intendimus animum magis videtur necessarium.

Omnes itaque nos Christi ancillae[14] et in Christo filiae tuae duo nunc a tua paternitate supplices postulamus, quae nobis admodum necessaria providemus. Quorum quidem alterum est ut nos instruere velis unde sanctimonialium ordo coeperit, et quae nostrae sit professionis auctoritas. Alterum vero est[15] ut aliquam nobis regulam instituas, et scriptam dirigas quae feminarum sit propria et ex integro nostrae conversionis[16] statum habitumque describat,[17] quod nondum a Patribus sanctis actum esse conspeximus.[18] Cuius quidem rei defectu et indigentia nunc agitur ut ad eiusdem regulae professionem tam mares quam feminae in monasteriis suscipiantur, et idem institutionis monasticae iugum imponitur infirmo sexui aeque ut forti.

Unam quippe nunc Regulam beati Benedicti apud Latinos feminae profitentur aeque ut[19] viri. Quam sicut viris solummodo constat scriptam esse ita et ab ipsis tantum impleri posse tam subiectis pariter[20] quam praelatis. Ut enim cetera nunc omittam Regulae capitula, quid ad feminas quod de cucullis,[21] femoralibus et scapularibus ibi scriptum est? Quid denique ad ipsas de tunicis aut de laneis ad carnem indumentis, cum earum humoris[22] superflui menstruae purgationes haec omnino[23] refugiant?[24] Quid ad ipsas etiam quod de abbate statuitur[25] ut ipse lectionem dicat evangelicam[26] et post ipsam hymnum incipiat? Quid[27] de mensa abbatis seorsum[28] cum peregrinis et hospitibus constituenda? Numquid nostrae convenit religioni ut vel numquam[29] hospitium viris praebeat aut cum his quos[30] susceperit viris abbatissa comedat? O quam facilis ad ruinam animarum virorum ac mulierum in unum cohabitatio! Maxime vero in mensa ubi crapula dominatur et ebrietas et vinum in dulcedine bibitur *in quo est luxuria.*[31] Quod et beatus praecavens Hieronymus ad matrem et filiam scribens meminit dicens:[32] Difficile inter epulas servatur pudicitia. Ipse quoque[33] poeta luxuriae turpitudinisque doctor libro amatoriae artis intitulato quantam fornicationis occasionem convivia maxime praebeant studiose exsequitur[34] dicens:[35]

> Vinaque cum bibulas sparsere Cupidinis alas
> permanet et <capto>[36] stat gravis ille loco . . .
> Tunc veniunt risus tunc pauper cornua sumit:
> Tunc dolor et curae rugaque frontis abiit[37] . . .
> Illic[38] saepe animos iuvenum rapuere puellae
> Et Venus in vinis[39] ignis in igne fuit.[40]

Numquid et si feminas solas hospitio susceptas ad mensam admiserint, nullum ibi latet periculum? Certe in seducenda muliere nullum est aeque facile ut lenocinium muliebre. Nec[41] corruptae mentis turpitudinem ita prompte cuiquam mulier committit sicut mulieri. Unde et praedictus Hieronymus maxime saecularium[42] accessus feminarum vitare propositi sancti feminas adhortatur.[43] Denique si viris ab hospitalitate nostra exclusis solas admittamus feminas, quis non videat quanta exasperatione viros offendamus quorum beneficiis monasteria sexus infirmi egent, maxime si eis a quibus plus accipiunt minus aut omnino nihil largiri videantur? Quod si praedictae Regulae tenor a nobis impleri non potest, vereor ne illud apostoli Iacobi[44] in nostram quoque damnationem dictum sit: *Quicunque totam legem observaverit offendat autem in uno factus est omnium reus.* Quod est dicere de hoc etiam[45] ipso reus statuitur qui peragit multa quod non implet omnia. Et transgressor legis efficitur ex uno cuius impletor non fuerit nisi omnibus consummatis eius praeceptis. Quod ipse statim diligenter exponens apostolus adiecit:[46] *Qui enim dixit: Non moechaberis, dixit et: Non occides. Quod si non moechaberis, occidas autem, factus es transgressor legis.* Ac si aperte dicat: Ideo quilibet reus fit de transgressione uniuscuiuslibet praecepti quia ipse Dominus,[47] qui praecipit unum, praecipit et[48] aliud. Et quodcumque[49] legis violetur praeceptum, ipse contemnitur qui[50] legem non in uno sed in omnibus pariter mandatis constituit.

---

[12] Cf. Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* IV, 35, 75.

[13] *add* hiis expunged *A.*

[14] ancillicae *BR.*

[15] *om. A.*

[16] conversationis *C Amb.*] professionis *FG.*

[17] describas *CEF.*

[18] aspeximus *CEF.*

[19] et *ACEF.*

[20] *add* patet *AC.*

[21] Chap. 55. *Sancti Benedicti Regula Monasteriorum* (ed. tertia). Cuthbert Butler, (St. Louis, 1935).

[22] humores *CEF.*

[23] non *CE.*

[24] refugiantur *CE.*

[25] Cf. *Reg.* xi.

[26] euvangelicam *A* always spells the word thus.

[27] *add* est *CEF.* Cf. *Reg.*, c. 56.

[28] seorsim *Amb.*

[29] umquam *CEF.*

[30] quod *T.*

[31] *Ephesians* v, 18.

[32] *Ep.* 117, 6; CSEL, 55, I, 2. p. 429; PL22, 957.

[33] *om. BR.*

[34] exequitur *C Amb.*

[35] Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* I, 233-4, 239-240, 243-4.

[36] coepto all *Mss* and *Amb.*

[37] abit *RT.*

[38] ibi *A.*

[39] venis] *BCRT.*

[40] furit *BCF Amb.*

Ut autem praeteream illa Regulae instituta quae penitus observare non possumus, aut sine periculo non valemus, ubi[51] umquam ad colligendas messes conventus monialium exire vel labores agrorum habere consuevit; aut suscipiendarum feminarum constantiam uno anno probaverit, easque tertio perlecta Regula, sicut in ipsa iubetur,[52] instruxerit? Quid rursum stultius quam viam ignotam nec[53] adhuc demonstratam aggredi? Quid praesumptuosius quam eligere ac profiteri vitam quam nescias, aut votum facere quod implere[54] non[55] queas? Sed et cum omnium virtutum discretio sit mater,[56] et omnium bonorum moderatrix[57] sit[58] ratio, quis[59] aut virtutem aut bonum censeat quod ab istis dissentire videat?[60] Ipsas quippe virtutes excedentes modum atque mensuram sicut Hieronymus asserit inter vitia reputari convenit.[61] Quis autem ab omni ratione ac discretione seiunctum non videat, si ad imponenda onera eorum, quibus imponuntur, valitudines prius non discutiantur ut naturae constitutionem humana sequatur industria? Quis asinum sarcina tanta qua dignum iudicat elephantem? Quis tanta pueris aut senibus quanta viris iniungat? Tanta debilibus scilicet quanta fortibus; tanta infirmis quanta sanis; tanta feminis quanta maribus, infirmiori videlicet sexui quanta et forti? Quod diligenter beatus papa Gregorius attendens, Pastoralis[62] sui capitulo XXIV[63] tam de admonendis quam de praecipiendis ita distinxit: Aliter igitur admonendi sunt viri, atque aliter feminae quia illis gravia, istis vero sunt iniungenda leviora et illos[64] magna exerceant, istas vero levia demulcendo convertant.

Certe et qui monachorum regulas scripserunt nec solum de feminis omnino tacuerunt, verum etiam illa statuerunt quae eis nullatenus convenire sciebant; satis commode innuerunt nequaquam eodem iugo regulae tauri et iuvencae premendam esse cervicem quia, quos dispares natura creavit, aequari labore non convenit. Huius autem discretionis beatus non immemor Benedictus, tamquam omnium iustorum spiritu plenus, pro qualitate hominum aut temporum cuncta sic moderatur in regula ut omnia sicut ipsemet[65] uno concludit loco mensurate[66] fiant. Primo itaque ab ipso incipiens abbate, praecipit eum ita subiectis praesidere[67] ut "secundum unius,[68] inquit, cuiusque qualitatem vel intelligentiam ita se omnibus conformet et aptet ut non solum detrimenta gregis sibi commissi[69] non patiatur, verum in augmentatione boni gregis gaudeat, suamque fragilitatem semper suspectus sit, memineritque calamum quassatum non conterendum." . . . "Discernat[70] et <temperet>[71] cogitans discretionem sancti[72] Iacob dicentis:[73] *Si greges meos plus in ambulando fecero laborare, morientur cuncti una die.* Haec[74] ergo aliaque testimonia discretionis matris virtutum sumens, sic omnino[75] temperet ut sit[76] et fortes quod cupiant et infirmi non refugiant."

---

[41] ne *T.*

[42] *om. BR.*

[43] Cf. *Ep.* 22, 16; CSEL 55, I, 1, p. 163; PL 22, 403.

[44] *Ep.* 2, 10.

[45] *om. T. Amb.*

[46] *James* ii, 11.

[47] Deus *BR.*

[48] *om. CEF.*

[49] quicumque *BR.*

[50] qui legem *om. BR.*

[51] nisi *BR.*

[52] *Reg.*, c. 58.

[53] nec by correction *T.*

[54] complere *BR.*

[55] non queas] nequeas *BCEFR.*

[56] Cf. Cassian, *Collationes* 2, 4; CSEL 13, II, p. 44: PL 49, 528: omnium namque virtutum generatrix, custos moderatrixque discretio est.

[57] mediatrix *T Amb.*, but moderatrix *G.*

[58] fit *Amb.*

[59] quid *A.*

[60] videatur *Amb.*

[61] Cf. Ep. 130, 11; CSEL 56, I, 3, p. 191; PL 22, 1116.

[62] Pastorali *T.*

[63] XIV *Amb*] 4 *F.* III, 1 (24); PL 77, 51C.

[64] alios *T Amb.*

Ad hanc quidem dispensationis moderationem indulgentia[77] pertinet puerorum, senum et omnino debilium, lectoris seu septimanariorum, coquinae ante alios refectio, et in ipso etiam conventu de ipsa cibi vel potus qualitate seu quantitate pro diversitate hominum providentia de quibus quidem singulis ibi diligenter scriptum est. Ipsa quoque statuta ieiunii tempora pro qualitate temporis vel quantitate laboris ita relaxat prout naturae postulat infirmitas.[78] Quid, obsecro, ubi iste qui sic ad hominum et temporum qualitatem omnia moderatur ut ab omnibus sine murmuratione perferri[79] queant quae[80] instituuntur? Quid, inquam, de feminis provideret, si eis quoque pariter ut viris regulam institueret? Si enim in quibusdam regulae rigorem pueris, senibus et debilibus pro ipsa naturae debilitate vel infirmitate temperare cogitur, quid[81] de fragili sexu provideret cuius maxime debilis et infirma natura cognoscitur?

Perpende itaque[82] quam longe absistat ab omni[83] rationis discretione eiusdem regulae professione tam feminas quam viros obligari, eademque sarcina tam debiles quam fortes onerari.[84] Satis esse nostrae arbitror infirmitati, si nos ipsis Ecclesiae rectoribus et, qui in sacris ordinibus constituti sunt clericis tam continentiae quam abstinentiae virtus aequaverit, maxime cum Veritas dicat:[85] *Perfectus omnis erit si sit sicut magister eius.* Quibus[86] etiam pro magno reputandum esset, si religiosos laicos aequiparare possemus; quae namque in fortibus parva censemus, in debilibus admiramur et iuxta illud[87] Apostoli: *Virtus in infirmitate perficitur.* Ne vero[88] laicorum religio pro parvo ducatur, qualis fuit Abrahae, David, Iob,[89] licet coniugatorum, Chrysostomus *in Epistola ad Hebraeos sermone septimo* nobis occurrit dicens:[90]

> Sunt multa in quibus . . . poterit laborare ut bestiam illam incantet. Quae sunt ista? Labores, lectiones, vigiliae. Sed quid ad nos, inquit,[91] qui non sumus monachi? Haec mihi dicis? Dic Paulo, cum dicit:[92] *Vigilantes in omni patientia et oratione*; cum dicit: *Carnis curam ne feceritis in concupiscentiis.* Non enim haec monachis scribebat tantum, sed omnibus qui erant in civitatibus. Non enim saecularis homo debet aliquid amplius habere monacho

---

[65] insemet *AE*.

[66] *Reg.*, c. 48.

[67] praesidem *A*] praesideri *BR*.

[68] secundum . . . gaudeat *Reg.*, c. 2; suamque . . . conterendum. *Reg.*, c. 64.

[69] commissum *T*.

[70] Discernat . . . refugiant *Reg.*, c. 64.

[71] tempora all *Mss* and *Amb*. temporet in text of the *Rule*.

[72] beati *BR*.

[73] *Gen.* xxxiii, 13.

[74] Hae *T*.

[75] omnino ABCERT *Amb;* omnia in *Rule*.

[76] ut et fortes sit *AET Amb.*] ut sit quod fortes *BFR*.

[77] *Reg.*, cc. 35-41.

[78] *Reg.*, c. 36.

[79] proferri *BRT Amb.*] profiteri *G*.

[80] *om. BRT*.

[81] quid . . . instituerit *om. ACEF*.

[82] *om. ACEF*.

[83] omnibus *CE*.

[84] *Reg.*, c. 48.

[85] *Luke* vi, 40.

[86] Quibus . . . possemus *om. ACEF*.

[87] *II Cor.* xii, 9.

[88] *om. ACEF*.

[89] Jacob *AEFG*.

[90] *Hom. in Epis. ad Hebraeos* 7, 4; PG 63, 289-90 ('Mutianus' Translation).

[91] inquis in text.

[92] Cf. *Ephesians* vi. 18.

> quam cum uxore concumbere tantum. Hic enim habet veniam, in aliis autem nequaquam, sed omnia aequaliter sicut[93] monachi agere debent.[94] Nam et beatitudines quae a Christo dicuntur non monachis tantum dictae sunt . . . alioquin universus mundus peribit . . . et in angustum inclusit ea quae virtutis sunt. Et quomodo honorabiles[95] sunt nuptiae quae nobis tantum impediunt.

Ex quibus quidem verbis aperte colligitur quod quisquis evangelicis praeceptis continentiae virtutem addiderit, monasticam perfectionem implebit.

Atque utinam ad hoc nostra religio conscendere posset ut Evangelium impleret, non transcenderet, nec[96] plusquam christianae appeteremus esse. Hinc profecto, ni fallor, sancti decreverunt Patres non ita nobis sicut viris generalem aliquam regulam quasi novam legem praefigere, nec magnitudine votorum nostram infirmitatem onerare, attendentes illud[97] Apostoli: *Lex enim iram operatur. Ubi enim non est lex nec praevaricatio.* Et iterum:[98] *Lex autem subintravit ut abundaret delictum.* Idem quoque maximus continentiae praedicator de infirmitate nostra plurimum confidens, et quasi ad secundas nuptias urgens iuniores viduas: *Volo*, inquit,[99] *iuniores nubere, filios procreare, matresfamilias esse, nullam occasionem dare adversario* etc.[100] Quod et beatus Hieronymus saluberrimum esse considerans Eustochio de improvisis feminarum votis consulit his verbis:[1]

> Si autem et illae quae virgines sunt, ob alias tamen culpas non salvantur quid fiet illis quae prostituerunt membra Christi, et mutaverunt templum Spiritus Sancti in lupanar? . . . Rectius fuerat homini subisse coniugium ambulasse per plana quam per[2] altiora tendentem[3] in profundum inferni cadere.

Quarum etiam <*temerariae*>[4] professioni sanctus Augustinus consulens in libro *De continentia viduali ad Iulianam*[5] scribit his verbis:[6]

> Quae non coepit, deliberet; quae aggressa est, perseveret. Nulla adversario detur occasio; nulla Christo subtrahatur oblatio.

Hinc etiam canones[7] nostrae infirmitati consulentes decreverunt diaconissas ante quadraginta annos ordinari non debere, et hoc cum diligenti probatione, cum a viginti annis liceat diaconos promoveri.

Sunt et in[8] monasteriis qui regulares dicuntur canonici[9] beati Augustini quamdam,[10] ut aiunt, regulam profitentes qui se inferiores monachis nullatenus arbitrantur, licet eos et vesci carnibus et lineis uti videamus. Quorum quidem virtutem, si nostra exaequare[11] infirmitas posset, numquid pro minimo habendum esset? Ut autem nobis[12] de omnibus cibis tutius ac levius[13] indulgeatur, ipsa quoque natura providit quae maiore scilicet sobrietatis virtute sexum nostrum praemunivit. Constat quippe multo parciore sumptu et alimonia minore feminas quam viros sustentari posse, nec eas tam leviter inebriari physica protestatur.

---

[93] sicut mon. aeq. *BR.*

[94] debet *F Amb.*

[95] Cf. *Hebrews* xiii, 4.

[96] ne *T Amb.*

[97] *Romans* iv, 15.

[98] *Ibid.* v, 20.

[99] *I Tim.* v, 14.

[100] *om. Amb.*

[1] *Ep.* 22, 6; CSEL 54, I, 1, p. 150 ff.; PL 22, 397.

[2] ad *F*] *om. BRT Amb.*

[3] intendentem *ABR Amb.*

[4] temere all *Mss.*

[5] Iulianum *ACEF Amb.*

[6] *De Bono Viduitatis* 9, 12; CSEL 41, 5, 3, p. 317; PL 40, 437.

[7] The Council of Chalcedon (451), canon 15, put the age down to forty years for the 'ordination' of a deaconess. Cf. Hefele Le Clerq, *Histoire des Conciles* 2, 2, p. 803. Formerly it had been sixty.

[8] *om. T.*

[9] For the Regular Canons see note 32, p. 178, of my edition "Historia Calamitatum," *Mediaeval Studies*, 1950.

[10] reg. quamdam ut aiunt *AEF.*

[11] adaequare *EFG.*

[12] *om. Amb.*

[13] lenius *BF Amb.*

Unde[14] et Macrobius Theodosius Saturnaliorum libro septimo[15] meminit his verbis:[16]

> Aristoteles mulieres inquit raro ebriantur[17] crebro senes . . . Mulier humectissimo est corpore; docet hoc et levitas cutis et splendor, docent praecipue assiduae purgationes superfluo exonerantes corpus humore. Cum ergo epotum vinum in tam largum ceciderit humorem, vim suam perdit . . . nec facile cerebri sedem ferit fortitudine eius exstincta. Item: Muliebre corpus crebris purgationibus deputatum pluribus consertum <est>[18] foraminibus ut pateat in meatus et vias praebeat humori in egestionis exitum confluenti; per haec foramina vapor vini celeriter evanescit. Contra senibus siccum est corpus, quod probat asperitas et squalor cutis.

Ex his itaque perpende quanto tutius ac iustius naturae et infirmitati nostrae cibus quilibet[19] et potus indulgeri possit, quarum videlicet corda crapula et ebrietate gravari facile non possunt, cum ab illa nos cibi parcitas, ab ista feminei corporis qualitas, ut dictum est, protegat.[20]

Satis nostrae esse[21] infirmitati et maximum imputari debet,[22] si continenter ac sine proprietate viventes et, officiis occupatae divinis, ipsos Ecclesiae duces vel religiosos laicos in victu adaequemus, vel eos denique qui regulares canonici dicuntur et se praecipue vitam apostolicam sequi profitentur. Magnae postremo providentiae est his qui Deo se per votum obligant ut minus voveant, et plus exsequantur,[23] ut aliquid semper debitis gratia superaddant.[24] Hinc enim per semetipsam Veritas ait:[25] *Cum feceritis omnia quae praecepta sunt,*[26] *dicite: Servi inutiles sumus quae*[27] *debuimus facere fecimus.* Ac si aperte diceret: Ideo inutiles et quasi pro nihilo ac sine meritis reputandi quia debitis tantum exsolvendis contenti,[28] nihil ex gratia superaddidimus.[29] De quibus quidem gratis superaddendis ipse quoque Dominus alibi parabolice loquens ait:[30] Sed et si quid supererogaveris, ego cum rediero reddam tibi. Quod quidem hoc tempore multi monasticae religionis temerarii professores, si diligentius attenderent, et in quam professionem iurarent antea[31] providerent, atque[32] ipsum Regulae tenorem studiose perscrutarentur, minus per ignorantiam offenderent,[33] et per negligentiam peccarent. Nunc vero indiscrete omnes fere pariter[34] ad monasticam conversionem[35] currentes, inordinate suscepti, inordinatius vivunt, et eadem facilitate qua ignotam Regulam profitentur eam contemnentes, consuetudines quas volunt pro lege statuunt.[36]

Providendum itaque nobis est ne id oneris feminae praesumamus in quo viros fere iam universos succumbere videmus,[37] immo et deficere. Senuisse iam mundum conspicimus hominesque ipsos cum ceteris quae mundi sunt pristinum naturae vigorem amisisse, et iuxta illud[38] Veritatis ipsam caritatem non tam multorum quam fere omnium refriguisse ut iam videlicet pro qualitate hominum ipsas propter homines scriptas vel mutari vel temperari[39] necesse sit Regulas.

Cuius quidem discretionis ipse quoque beatus non immemor Benedictus ita se monasticae districtionis[40] rigorem temperasse fatetur, ut descriptam a se

---

[14] dum *A.*

[15] quarto *CER.*

[16] Saturnalia VII, 6, 16-17.

[17] inebriantur *CEF Amb.*

[18] confectum *AE*] confertum *F.* est in text of Macrobius.

[19] quislibet *BT. Amb.*

[20] prorogat *A.*

[21] esse inf. *om. CEF.*

[22] *add* infirmitati *F.*

[23] exequantur *C Amb.*] exsequatur *T.*

[24] superaddat *F. Amb.*] superaddent *BR.*

[25] *Luke* xvii, 10.

[26] *add* vobis *F. Vulgate.*

[27] quod *Vulgate.*

[28] contempti *FRT.*

[29] superaddimus *BRT.*

[30] Cf. *Luke* x, 35.

[31] ant. prov.] animadverterent *Amb.*] ana-prov. with stroke over ana *T.*

[32] atqui *A.*

[33] offenderet *T.*

[34] *om. EF.*

[35] conversationem *Amb.*

[36] statuerunt *T.*

[37] videamus *T Amb*] *om. R.*

[38] Cf. *Matt.* xxiv, 12.

[39] temperare *Amb.*

[40] discretionis *BR Amb.*

Regulam comparatione priorum institutorum nonnisi quamdam honestatis institutionem et quamdam conversationis inchoationem reputet, dicens:[41]

> Regulam autem hanc descripsimus, ut hanc observantes . . . aliquatenus vel honestatem morum aut initium conversationis nos demonstremus habere. Ceterum ad perfectionem conversationis qui festinat sunt doctrinae sanctorum Patrum, quarum observatio perducat hominem ad celsitudinem perfectionis. Item: Quisquis ergo ad coelestem patriam festinas, hanc minimam inchoationis Regulam . . . adiuvante Christo, perfice, et tunc demum ad maiora . . . doctrinae virtutumque culmina, Deo protegente, pervenies.

Qui, ut ipse ait,[42] dum, quando[43] legamus olim sanctos Patres uno die psalterium explere solere, ita psalmodiam tepidis temperavit ut in ipsa per hebdomadem distributione psalmorum minore ipsorum numero monachi quam clerici sint[44] contenti.

Quid etiam tam religioni quietique monasticae contrarium est quam quod luxuriae fomentum maxime praestat et tumultus excitat, atque ipsam Dei in nobis imaginem, qua[45] praestamus ceteris, id est, rationem delet? Hoc autem vinum est quod supra[46] omnia victui pertinentia plurimum Scriptura damnosum asserit et caveri admonet. De quo et maximus ille sapientum in Proverbiis meminit dicens:[47] *Luxuriosa res vinum et tumultuosa ebrietas; quicunque his delectatur non erit sapiens. Cui*[48] *vae? Cuius patri vae? Cui rixae? Cui foveae? Cui sine causa vulnera? Cui suffusio*[49] *oculorum? Nonne his qui morantur in vino et student calicibus epotandis?*[50] *Ne intuearis vinum quando flavescit cum splenduerit in vitro color eius. Ingreditur blande, sed in novissimo mordebit ut coluber, et sicut regulus venena diffundet. Oculi tui videbunt extraneas*[51] *et cor tuum loquetur perversa. Et eris sicut dormiens in medio mari,*[52] *et quasi sopitus gubernator amisso clavo. Et dices: Verberaverunt me, sed non dolui; traxerunt me, et ego non sensi. Quando evigilabo, et rursus vina reperiam? Item:*[53] *Noli regibus, O Lamuel, noli regibus dare vinum, quia nullum secretum est ubi regnat ebrietas*[54] *ne forte bibant et obliviscantur iudiciorum et mutent*[55] *causam filiorum pauperis.* Et in Ecclesiastico[56] scriptum est: *Vinum et mulieres apostatare faciunt sapientes, et arguunt*[57] *sensatos.* Ipse quoque Hieronymus ad Nepotianum scribens de vita clericorum, et quasi graviter indignans quod sacerdotes legis ab omni quod inebriare[58] potest abstinentes nostros in hac abstinentia superent:[59]

> Nequaquam,[60] inquit, vinum redoleas ne audias illud[61] philosophi: Hoc non est osculum porrigere sed[62] propinare. Vinolentos[63] sacerdotes et Apostolus damnat et lex vetus prohibet.[64] Qui altari[65] deserviunt, vinum et siceram non bibant. Sicera Hebraeo sermone omnis potio nuncupatur quae inebriare potest, sive illa quae fermento conficitur, sive pomorum succo aut favi decoquuntur[66] in dulcem[67] et barbaram[68] potionem[69] aut palmarum fructus exprimuntur in liquorem coctisque frugibus aqua pinguior colatur.[70] Quicquid inebriat et statum mentis evertit, fuge similiter ut vinum.

---

[41] *Reg.*, c. 73.

[42] *Ibid.*, c. 18.

[43] dum quando] cum *F Amb.*

[44] essent *FG.*

[45] quam *A.*

[46] super *A.*

[47] *Prov.* xx, 1.

[48] *Prov.* xxiii, 29 ff.

[49] suffusitio *T.*

[50] eptitandis *T*] epudendis *BR*] expotandis *A.*

[51] extranea *BR.*

[52] maris *CEF.*

[53] *Prov.* xxxi, 4, 5.

[54] *add* et *Vulgate.*

[55] mittant *RT*] mutant *B.*

[56] xix, 2.

[57] arguent *Vulgate.*

[58] inebriari *T*] corrupt *R.*

[59] superant *ACEF. Ep.* 52, 11; CSEL 54, I, 1, p. 434; PL 22, 536.

[60] numquam *F* and text of Jerome.

[61] *locum non invenio.*

[62] *add* vinum *F Amb.*

[63] vinolentes *RT*] vinolantes *B.*

[64] Cf. *Lev.* x, 9.

[65] altario *ABRT Amb.*

[66] decoquitur *ABRT Amb.*

[67] dulce *BRT*] dulcedine *ACE Amb.*

[68] herbarum *ABCERT Amb.*

[69] potiones *A.*

[70] coloratur *F.*

Ecce quod regum deliciis interdicitur, sacerdotibus penitus denegatur, et cibis omnibus periculosius esse constat. Ipse tamen tam spiritalis[71] vir beatus Benedictus dispensatione quadam praesentis aetatis indulgere monachis cogitur. "Licet, inquit,[72] legamus[73] vinum monachorum omnino non esse sed quia nostris temporibus id[74] monachis persuaderi non potest etc." Legerat ni fallor quod in Vitis Patrum scriptum est[75] his verbis:

> Narraverunt quidam abbati Pastori de quodam monacho quia non bibebat vinum, et dixit eis quia[76] vinum monachorum omnino[77] non est. Item post aliqua: Facta est aliquando celebratio missarum in monte abbatis Antonii et inventum est ibi cenidium vini. Et tollens[78] unus de senibus parvum vas, calicem portavit ad abbatem Sisoi et dedit ei. Et bibit semel, et secundo et accepit et bibit; obtulit ei et tertio, sed non accepit dicens: Quiesce frater an[79] nescis quia est Satanas? Et iterum de abbate Sisoi: Dicit ergo Abraham discipulus eius: Si occurritur in Sabbato et Dominica ad ecclesiam, et biberit tres calices, ne multo[80] est? Et dixit senex: Si non esset Satanas, non esset multum.

Ubi umquam, quaeso, carnes a Deo damnatae sunt vel monachis interdictae? Vide, obsecro, et attende qua necessitate Regulam temperet in eo etiam quod periculosius est monachis, et quod eorum non esse noverit, quia videlicet huius abstinentia temporibus suis monachis iam persuaderi non poterat. Utinam eadem dispensatione et in hoc tempore ageretur ut videlicet in his quae media boni et mali atque indifferentia dicuntur, tale temperamentum fieret[81] ut quod iam persuaderi non valet, professio non exigeret, mediisque omnibus sine scandalo concessis, sola[82] interdici peccata sufficeret, et sic quoque in cibis sicut in vestimentis dispensaretur, ut, quod vilius comparari[83] posset, ministraretur, et per omnia necessitati, non superfluitati, consuleretur. Non enim magnopere sunt curanda quae nos regno Dei non praeparant, vel quae nos minime Deo commendant. Haec vero sunt omnia quae exterius geruntur, et aeque[84] reprobis ut electis,[85] aeque hypocritis ut religiosis communia sunt. Nihil quippe inter Iudaeos et Christianos ita separat sicut exteriorum operum et interiorum discretio, praesertim cum inter filios Dei et diaboli sola caritas discernat[86] quam plenitudinem legis et finem praecepti Apostolus vocat.[87] Unde et ipse hanc operum gloriam prorsus extenuans ut fidei praeferat iustitiam Iudaeum[88] alloquens dicit:[89] *Ubi est ergo*[90] *gloriatio tua? Exclusa est. Per quam legem? Factorum? Non; sed per legem fidei. Arbitramur enim*[91] *hominem iustificari per fidem sine operibus legis.* Item:[92] *Si enim Abraham ex operibus legis iustificatus est, habet gloriam, sed non apud Deum. Quid enim dicit Scriptura? Credidit Abraham Deo, et reputatum est ei ad iustitiam.* Et rursum:[93] *Ei, inquit, qui non operatur, credenti autem in eum*[94] *qui iustificat impium, deputatur*[95] *fides eius ad iustitiam secundum propositum gratiae Dei.*

Idem etiam omnium ciborum esum Christianis indulgens, et ab his ea quae iustificant distinguens: *Non est*, inquit,[96] *regnum Dei esca et potus, sed iustitia*

---

[71] spiritualis *EF.*

[72] *Reg.* 40.

[73] *Vitae Patrum* (*Verba seniorum*) 5, 4, 31; PL 73, 868D.

[74] hoc *B Amb*] his *T.*

[75] *Ibid.*, 869CD.

[76] qui *A*] quod *F.*

[77] *om. ACEF.*

[78] extollens *Amb.*

[79] aut *ATCEF.*

[80] multum *F Amb.*

[81] fiet *BRT.*

[82] solum *CEF.*

[83] compari *A.*

[84] These words occur also in Letter III; *Mediaeval Studies*, XV (1953), 82. See discussion of the source of this doctrine, *ibid.* 55-6.

[85] deiectis *Amb.*

[86] decernat *A.*

[87] Cf. *Romans* xiii, 10; *I Tim.* i, 5.

[88] Iudaeam *Amb.*] in Deum *BR.*

[89] *Romans* iii, 27, 28.

[90] *om. FT Amb.*

[91] eum *Amb.*

[92] *Romans* iv, 2, 3.

[93] *Ibid.*, 5.

[94] Deum *Amb.*

[95] reputatur *Vulgate.*

[96] *Romans* xiv, 17, 20, 21.

et pax et gaudium in Spiritu sancto. . . . Omnia quidem munda sunt; sed malum est homini qui per offendiculum manducat. Bonum est non manducare carnem, et non bibere vinum, neque in quo frater tuus offendatur[97] *aut scandalizetur aut infirmetur.* Non enim hoc loco ulla[98] cibi comestio interdicitur, sed comestionis offensio qua videlicet quidam[99] ex conversis Iudaeis scandalizabantur, cum viderent ea quoque comedi quae lex interdixerat. Quod quidem scandalum apostolus etiam Petrus cupiens evitare graviter ab ipso est obiurgatus, et salubriter correptus,[100] sicut ipsemet Paulus ad Galatas scribens commemorat[1] qui rursus Corinthiis scribens:[2] *Esca autem nos non commendat Deo.* Et rursum:[3] *Omne quod in macello venit manducate. . . . Domini est terra et plenitudo eius.* Et ad *Colossenses:*[4] *Nemo ergo vos iudicet in cibo aut in potu.* Et post aliqua:[5] *Si mortui estis cum Christo ab elementis huius mundi, quid adhuc tamquam viventes in mundo decernitis? Ne tetigeritis neque gustaveritis, neque contrectaveritis, quae sunt omnia in interitu*[6] *ipso usu secundum praeceptum*[7] *et doctrinas hominum.* Elementa huius mundi vocat prima legis rudimenta secundum carnales observantias in quarum videlicet doctrina, quasi in addiscendis litteralibus elementis, primo se mundus, id est, carnalis adhuc populus exercebat. Ab his quidem elementis, id est, carnalibus observantiis tam Christus, quam sui mortui sunt, cum nihil his debeant, iam non in hoc mundo viventes, hoc est, inter carnales figuris intendentes et decernentes, id est, distinguentes quosdam cibos vel quaslibet res ab aliis atque ita dicentes: Ne[8] tetigeritis haec vel illa etc.[9] Quae scilicet tacta vel gustata, vel contrectata, inquit Apostolus, sunt in interitu animae ipso suo usu quo videlicet ipsis ad aliquam etiam utimur utilitatem[10] secundum, inquam, praeceptum et doctrinas hominum, id est, carnalium et legem carnaliter intelligentium potius quam Christi vel suorum.

Hic enim cum ad praedicandum ipsos destinaret apostolos, ubi magis ipsi[10a] ab omnibus scandalis providendum erat, omnium tamen ciborum esum ita eis indulsit, ut apud quoscumque suscipiantur hospitio, ita sicut illi victitent, *edentes*[11] scilicet *et bibentes quae apud illos sunt.*

Ab hoc profecto Dominica suaque disciplina illos recessuros ipse iam Paulus per Spiritum providebat. De quibus ad Timotheum scribit dicens:[12] *Spiritus autem manifeste dicit quia in novissimis temporibus discedent quidam a fide attendentes spiritibus erroris et doctrinis daemoniorum in hypocrisi loquentium mendacium . . . prohibentium nubere, abstinere a cibis quos Deus creavit ad percipiendum cum gratiarum actione fidelibus, et his qui cognoverunt veritatem, quia omnis creatura Dei bona est*[13] *et nihil reiciendum quod cum gratiarum actione percipitur; sanctificatur enim per verbum Dei et orationem. Haec proponens fratribus, bonus eris minister Christi Iesu, enutritus*[14] *verbis fidei et bonae doctrinae quam adsecutus es.*

Quis denique Ioannem eiusque discipulos abstinentia nimia se macerantes ipsi Christo eiusque discipulis in religione non praeferat, si corporalem oculum ad exterioris abstinentiae intendat exhibitionem? De quo etiam ipsi discipuli Ioannis adversus Christum et suos murmurantes, tamquam adhuc in exterioribus iudaizantes, ipsum interrogaverunt Dominum dicentes:[15] *Quare nos et Pharisaei ieiunamus frequenter, discipuli autem tui non ieiunant?* Quod diligenter attendens beatus Augustinus, et quid inter virtutem et virtutis exhibitionem referat distinguens,[16] ita[17] quae fiunt exterius pensat ut nihil meritis superaddant opera. Ait quippe sic in libro *De Bono Coniugali:*[18]

---

[97] These three verbs are in the indicative in the *Vulgate.*

[98] illa *CEF.*

[99] quidem *BCER.*

[100] correctus *CFT Amb.*

[1] *Galatians* ii, 11. ff.

[2] *I Cor.* viii, 8.

[3] *Ibid.*, x, 25, 26.

[4] ii, 16.

[5] ii, 20-22.

[6] interitum *Vulgate.*

[7] praecepta *CE Vulgate.*

[8] nec *CEF.*

[9] om. *Amb.*

[10] humilitatem *Amb.*] vilitatem *G*, by corr. *T.*

[10a] ipsis *A.*

[11] *Luke* x, 7.

[12] *I Tim* iv, 1 ff.

[13] *om. ABCERT Amb.*

[14] nutritus *ABEF.*

[15] *Matt.* ix, 14.

> Continentia, non corporis, sed animae virtus est. Virtutes autem animi aliquando in opere[19] manifestantur, aliquando in habitu latent,[20] sicut martyrum virtus apparuit[21] in tolerando passiones. Item: Iam enim erat in Iob patientia quam noverat Dominus, et cui testimonium perhibebat, sed hominibus innotuit tentationis examine. Item: Verum ut apertius intelligatur quomodo sit virtus in habitu etiamsi non sit in opere, loquor de exemplo de quo nullus dubitat Catholicorum. Dominus Iesus, quod in veritate carnis esurierit[22] et sitierit et manducaverit et biberit, nullus ambigit eorum qui ex eius Evangelio fideles sunt. Num[23] igitur non[24] erat in illo continentiae virtus a cibo et potu, quanta erat in Ioanne Baptista? *Venit*[25] *enim Ioannes non manducans neque bibens et dixerunt: Daemonium habet. Venit Filius hominis manducans et bibens et dixerunt: Ecce homo vorax et potator vini, amicus publicanorum et peccatorum.* Item deinde: . . . ibi subiecit cum de Ioanne ac de se illa dixisset: *Iustificata est sapientia a filiis suis*, qui virtutem continentiae vident in habitu animi semper esse debere, in opere autem pro rerum ac temporum opportunitate manifestari, sicut virtus patientiae sanctorum martyrum . . . Quocirca sicut non est impar meritum patientiae[26] in Petro qui passus est, et in Ioanne qui passus non est; sic non est impar meritum continentiae in Ioanne qui nullas expertus est nuptias, et in Abraham qui filios generavit. Et illius enim caelibatus, et illius connubium pro distributione temporum Christo militaverunt. Sed continentiam Ioannes et[27] in opere, Abraham vero in solo habitu habebat.
>
> Illo itaque tempore cum et lex, dies patriarcharum subsequens, maledictum dixit[28] qui non excitaret semen in Israel, et qui[29] poterat non promebat, sed tamen habebat. Ex quo autem venit plenitudo temporis ut diceretur:[30] *Qui potest capere, capiat* . . . qui habet, operatur,[31] qui operari noluerit, non se habere mentiatur.

Ex his liquide verbis colligitur solas apud Deum merita virtutes obtinere, et quicumque virtutibus pares sunt, quantumcumque distent[32] operibus, aequaliter ab[33] ipso promereri. Unde quicumque sunt vere Christiani sic toti circa interiorem hominem sunt occupati ut eum[34] scilicet virtutibus ornent et vitiis mundent, ut de exteriori nullam vel minimam assumant curam. Unde et ipsos legimus[35] apostolos ita rusticane et velut inhoneste in ipso etiam Domini comitatu se habuisse ut, velut omnis reverentiae atque honestatis obliti, cum per sata transirent spicas vellere, fricare[36] et comedere more puerorum non erubescerent, nec de ipsa etiam manuum ablutione, cum cibos[37] essent accepturi, sollicitos esse. Qui cum a nonnullis quasi de immunditia arguerentur, eos Dominus excusans:[38] *Non lotis*, inquit, *manibus manducare, non coinquinat hominem.* Ubi et statim generaliter adiecit ex nullis exterioribus animam inquinari, sed ex his tantum quae de corde prodeunt, quae sunt, inquit,[39] *cogitationes, adulteria homicidia* etc. Nisi enim prius prava[40] voluntate animus corrumpatur, peccatum esse non poterit, quicquid exterius agatur in corpore. Unde et bene ipsa quoque adulteria sive homicidia ex corde procedere dicit, quae[41] et sine tactu[42] corporum perpetrantur iuxta illud:[43] *Qui viderit mulierem ad concupiscendum eam, iam moechatus est eam in corde suo* et:[44] *Omnis qui odit fratrem suum homicida est.* Et tactis vel laesis corporibus minime peraguntur, quando[45] videlicet per violentiam opprimitur[46] aliqua, vel per iustitiam coactus iudex interficit reum. Omnis quippe homicida, sicut scriptum est,[47] non habet partem in regno Christi[48] et Dei.

---

[16] attendens *F Amb.*

[17] ita quae] itaque *BERT.*

[18] 21, 25-26; CSEL 41, 5, 3, pp. 218-222; PL 40, 390-1.

[19] corpore *ABCEFRT Amb.*

[20] *om. Amb.*

[21] emicuit apparuitque *F* and Text of Augustine.

[22] esusierit *T.*

[23] non *BR*] nec *CE.*

[24] *om. CE.*

[25] *Matt.* xi, 18 ff.

[26] patientiae . . . meritum *om. ACEF.*

[27] *om. ACEF.*

[28] *Deut.* xxv, 5-10.

[29] *add* non all *Mss* and *Amb.* The critical text of Augustine does not list it even as a variant. St. Augustine means, as he goes on to say, that because of the precept to marry, a man who had continence as a habit had no opportunity to show it in act. But the text of *Deuteronomy* to which he refers applies only to a brother-in-law of a widow.

[30] *Matt.* xix, 12.

[31] operetur *F Amb.*

[32] distant *BR.*

[33] a Christo *A*] in Christo *CEF.*

[34] *add* hominem *CEF.*

[35] *Matt.* xii, 1 ff.

[36] fabricare *T Amb.*

[37] *add* scilicet (licet *F*) apostoli *CEF.*

[38] *Matt.* xv, 20.

Non[49] itaque magnopere quae fiunt sed quo animo fiant pensandum est, si illi placere studemus, qui cordis et renum probator[50] est, et in abscondito videt,[51] *qui iudicabit occulta hominum,* Paulus inquit,[52] *secundum Evangelium meum,* hoc est, secundum meae praedicationis doctrinam. Unde et modica viduae oblatio quae fuit duo minuta, id est, quadrans,[53] omnium divitum oblationibus copiosis praelata est ab illo cui dicitur:[54] *Bonorum meorum non eges,* cui magis oblatio ex offerente quam offerens placet ex oblatione sicut scriptum est:[55] *Respexit Dominus ad Abel et ad munera eius,* ut videlicet prius devotionem offerentis inspiceret, et sic ex ipso[56] donum oblatum gratum haberet. Quae quidem animi devotio, tanto maior in Deo habetur, quanto in exterioribus minus[57] est animus occupatus, et tanto humilius ei deservimus, ac magis debere[58] cogitamus, quanto de exterioribus quae fiant, minus confidimus. Unde et Apostolus post communem ciborum indulgentiam de qua, ut supra meminimus, Timotheo scribit de exercitio quoque corporalis laboris adiunxit dicens:[59] *Exerce autem teipsum ad pietatem. Nam corporalis exercitatio ad modicum*[60] *utilis est. Pietas autem ad omnia utilis est, promissionem habens vitae quae nunc est et futurae,* quoniam pia mentis in Deum devotio et hic ab ipso meretur necessaria, et in futuro perpetua. Quibus quidem documentis quid aliud docemur quam Christiane sapere et cum Iacob de domesticis animalibus refectionem patri providere, non cum Esau[61] de silvestribus curam sumere[62] et in exterioribus iudaizare? Hinc et illud est Psalmistae:[63] *In me sunt Deus vota tua, quae*[63a] *reddam, laudationes tibi.* Ad hoc quoque illud adiunge poeticum:[64] Ne te quaesiveris extra.

Multa sunt et innumerabilia tam saecularium[65] quam ecclesiasticorum doctorum testimonia quibus ea, quae fiunt[66] exterius, et[67] indifferentia vocantur, non magnopere curanda esse docemur, alioquin legis opera et servitutis eius, sicut ait[68] Petrus, importabile iugum evangelicae libertati esset praeferendum, et suavi[69] iugo Christi et eius oneri levi.

Ad quod quidem suave iugum et onus leve per semetipsum Christus nos invitans: *Venite,* inquit,[70] *qui laboratis et onerati estis* etc.[71] Unde et praedictus apostolus quosdam iam ad Christum conversos, sed adhuc opera legis retineri censentes[72] vehementer obiurgans, sicut in Actibus apostolorum scriptum est, ait:[73] *Viri fratres . . . quid tentatis Deum, imponere iugum super cervicem discipulorum quod neque patres nostri neque nos portare potuimus? Sed per gratiam Domini Iesu*[74] *credimus salvari, quemadmodum et illi.* Et tu ipse, obsecro, non solum Christi, verum etiam huius imitator apostoli, discretione, sicut et nomine, sic operum praecepta moderare ut[75] infirmae convenit naturae, et ut divinae laudis plurimum vacare possimus officiis. Quam[76] quidem hostiam, exterioribus omnibus sacrificiis reprobatis, Dominus commendans ait:[77] *Si esuriero, non dicam tibi; meus est enim orbis terrae et plenitudo eius. Numquid manducabo carnes taurorum? Aut sanguinem hircorum potabo? Immola Deo sacrificium laudis, et redde Altissimo vota tua, et invoca me in die tribulationis; et eruam te, et honorificabis me.*

---

[39] Cf. *ibid.* 19.

[40] parva corrected in margin (*s.m.*) to prava *T.*

[41] qui *A.*

[42] tractu *T*] contactu *G.*

[43] *Matt.* v, 28.

[44] *I John* iii, 15.

[45] By correction *A.*

[46] By correction *A.*

[47] Cf. *I John* iii, 15.

[48] Christi et *om. Amb.*

[49] For the origin of this statement, see *Med. Studies,* XV (1953), 55.

[50] Cf. *Jeremias* xi, 20; *Psalm* vii, 10.

[51] Cf. *Matt.* vi, 4.

[52] *Romans* ii, 16.

[53] *add* Deo *CEF.* Cf. *Mark* xii, 42-44.

[54] *Psalm* xv, 2.

[55] *Gen.* iv, 4.

[56] ipsa *G.*

[57] minus . . . exterioribus *om. Amb.*

[58] *add* deservire *CEF.*

[59] *I Tim.* iv, 7, 8.

[60] modum *T. Amb.*

[61] Cf. *Gen.* xxvii, 6 ff.

[62] sumere with stroke over *m T.*

[63] *Psalm* lv, 12.

[63a] quas *G.*

[64] Persius, *Satires* I, 7.

[65] saecularum *AE.*

[66] sunt *BR Amb.*

[67] ex *BEGRT.*

[68] Cf. *Acts* xv, 10.

[69] Cf. *Matt.* xi, 30.

[70] Cf. *Matt.* xi, 28.

[71] retinere *Amb.*

[72] censantes *BR;* corrected to censentes *A.* retinere *Amb.*

Nec[78] id quidem ita loquimur ut laborem operum corporalium respuamus cum necessitas postulaverit, sed ne ista magna putemus quae corpori serviunt, et officii divini celebrationem praepediunt,[79] praesertim cum ex auctoritate apostolica id praecipue devotis indultum sit feminis ut alienae procurationis sustententur officiis magis quam de opere proprii laboris. Unde ad Timotheum Paulus:[80] *Si quis fidelis habet viduas, subministret illis, et non gravetur Ecclesia ut his, quae vere viduae sunt, sufficiat.* Veras[81] quippe viduas dicit quascumque Christo devotas, a quibus non solum maritus mortuus est, verum etiam[81a] mundus crucifixus est et ipsae mundo. Quas recte de dispendiis[82] Ecclesiae tamquam de propriis sponsi sui redditibus sustentari convenit. Unde et Dominus ipse matri suae procuratorem apostolum potius quam virum eius praevidit[83] et apostoli septem diaconos, id est, Ecclesiae ministros, qui devotis ministrarent feminis instituerunt.[84]

Scimus quidem et Apostolum Thessalonicensibus scribentem quosdam otiose vel curiose viventes adeo constrinxisse ut praeciperet:[85] *Quoniam si quis non vult operari, non manducet*, et beatum Benedictum maxime pro otiositate vitanda opera manuum iniunxisse.[86] Sed numquid[87] Maria otiose sedebat ut verba Christi audiret, Martha tam ei quam Domino laborante, et de quiete sororis tamquam invida murmurante, quasi quae sola *pondus*[88] *diei et aestus portaverit*? Unde et hodie frequenter murmurare eos cernimus, qui in exterioribus laborant, cum his, qui divinis occupati sunt officiis, terrena ministrant. Et saepe de his, quae tyranni rapiunt, minus conqueruntur quam quae[89] desidiosis, ut aiunt, istis et otiosis exsolvere coguntur, quos tamen non solum verba Christi audire, verum etiam in his assidue legendis et decantandis occupatos considerant esse. Nec attendunt non esse magnum, ut ait[90] Apostolus, si eis communicent corporalia a quibus exspectant spiritualia, nec indignum esse ut qui terrenis intendunt his, qui spiritualibus[91] occupantur, deserviant. Hinc etenim ex ipsa quoque legis sanctione ministris Ecclesiae haec salubris otii libertas concessa <est> ut tribus[92] Levi nihil hereditatis terrenae perciperet quo expeditius Domino deserviret, sed de labore aliorum decimas et oblationes susciperet.

De abstinentia quoque ieiuniorum quam magis vitiorum quam ciborum Christiani appetunt, si quid Ecclesiae institutioni superaddi decreveris, deliberandum est, et quod nobis expedit instituendum.

Maxime vero de officiis ecclesiasticis et de ordinatione psalmorum providendum est ut in hoc saltem si placet, nostram exoneres infirmitatem ne,[93] cum psalterium per hebdomadem expleamus, eosdem necesse sit psalmos repeti.[94] Quam etiam beatus Benedictus, cum eam pro visu suo distribuisset, in aliorum quoque optione[95] sua id reliquit[96] admonitio ut si, cui melius videretur, aliter ipsos ordinaret, attendens videlicet quod per temporum successionem Ecclesiae decor creverit, et quae prius rude susceperat fundamentum, postmodum aedificii nacta est ornamentum.

---

[73] *Acts* xv, 7, 10-11.
[74] *add* Christi *BEF Vulgate.*
[75] et *T.*
[76] quamdam *AC.*
[77] Cf. *Psalm* xlix, 12-15.
[78] ne *ABR.*
[79] impediunt *G.*
[80] *I Tim.* v, 16.
[81] vere *CEF.*
[81a] et *Amb.*
[82] spendis *A*] spendiis *BEFR.*
[83] providit *FG.* Cf. *John* xix, 26.
[84] Cf. *Acts* vi, 5.
[85] Cf. *II Thess*, iii, 10.
[86] Cf. *Reg.*, c. 48.
[87] nuncquid *A.* Cf. *Luke* x, 39 ff.
[88] *Matt.* xx, 12.
[89] *add* de his *CEF.*
[90] Cf. *I Cor.* ix, 11.
[91] spiritalibus *AT*] spiritibus *BR.*
[92] Cf. *Numbers* xviii, 21.
[93] nec *A.*

Illud autem prae omnibus definire te volumus quid de evangelica[97] lectione in vigiliis nocturnis nobis agendum sit. Periculosum quippe nobis[98] videtur eo tempore ad nos sacerdotes aut diaconos admitti, per quos haec lectio recitetur, quas praecipue ab omni hominum accessu atque aspectu segregatas esse convenit, tum ut sincerius Deo vacare possimus, tum etiam ut a tentatione tutiores simus.

Tibi nunc, domine, dum vivis incumbit instituere de nobis quid in perpetuum tenendum sit nobis. Tu[99] quippe post Deum huius loci fundator, tu per Deum nostrae congregationis es plantator, tu cum Deo nostrae sis religionis institutor. Praeceptorem alium post te fortassis habiturae sumus et qui[100] super alienum aliquid[1] aedificet fundamentum, ideoque, veremur, de nobis minus futurus sollicitus, vel a nobis minus audiendus, et qui denique, si aeque velit, non aeque possit. Loquere tu nobis et audiemus. Vale.

VI. (Rescriptum[1] ad ipsam de auctoritate[2] vel dignitate ordinis sanctimonialium.)

Caritati tuae, carissima soror de origine[3] tuae professionis tam tibi quam spiritualibus[4] filiabus tuis sciscitanti,[5] unde scilicet monialium coeperit religio paucis, si potero, succincteque rescribam. Monachorum siquidem sive monialium ordo a Domino nostro Iesu Christo religionis suae formam plenissime sumpsit; quamvis et ante ipsius Incarnationem nonnulla huius propositi tam in viris quam in feminis praecesserit inchoatio. Unde et Hieronymus ad Rusticum[6] scribens: "Filios," inquit, "Prophetarum quos monachos legimus in Veteri Testamento, etc." Annam quoque viduam templo et divino cultui assiduam evangelista[7] commemorat, quae pariter cum Simeone Dominum in templo suscipere, et prophetia[8] repleri meruerit.[9] Finis itaque Christus iustitiae et omnium bonorum consummatio, in plenitudine temporis veniens, ut inchoata perficeret bona vel[10] exhiberet incognita, sicut utrumque sexum vocare venerat atque redimere, ita utrumque sexum in vero monachatu suae congregationis dignatus est adunare ut inde tam viris quam[11] feminis huius professionis daretur auctoritas,[12] et omnibus perfectio vitae proponeretur[13] quam imitarentur.[14] Ibi quippe cum apostolis ceterisque discipulis, cum matre ipsius, sanctarum legimus[15] conventum mulierum quae scilicet saeculo abrenuntiantes omnemque proprietatem abdicantes ut solum possiderent Christum, sicut scriptum est:[16] *Dominus pars haereditatis meae*, devote illud compleverunt, quo omnes secundum regulam a Domino traditam conversi a[17] saeculo ad huius vitae communitatem[18] initiantur: *Nisi*[19]

---

[94] Corrected from repleti *T*.

[95] actione *CEFT Amb.*

[96] Cf. *Reg.* c. 18.

[97] Corrected from evangeliis *T*.

[98] *om. T Amb.*

[99] This sentence is much the same as one found in the first letter of Heloise. See *Med. Studies*, XV (1953), 69.

[100] quid *T*.

[1] aliud *FG*.

[1] *om. BCER*] item Petri ad eamden *T*] Heloyssae sorori charissimae Abaelardus in Christo (*s. m.*) *F*.

[2] actoritate *Ms.*

[3] ordine *BRT Amb.*

[4] spiritalibus *ART*. *Mss* often use the form spiritalis.

[5] suscitanti *Amb.*

[6] Eustochium *ABCERT Amb. Ep.* 125, 7; CSEL 56, 1, 3, p. 125; PL 22, 1076.

[7] Cf. *Luke* ii, 25 ff.

[8] *add* me (expunged) *T*.

[9] meruit *AC*.

[10] et *BFR*.

[11] *add* monachis (expunged) *T*.

[12] *Amboesius* always spells this word: authoritas.

[13] *add* potius *CEF*.

[14] imitaretur *CEF*.

[15] *Luke* viii, 2.

[16] *Psalm* xv, 5.

[17] *om. Amb.*

[18] Cf. *Acts* ii, 44 ff; iv, 32, ff.

[19] Cf. *Luke* xiv, 33.

quis renuntiaverit omnibus quae possidet, non potest meus esse discipulus. Quam devote autem Christum hae beatissimae mulieres ac vere moniales secutae fuerint, quantamque gratiam et honorem devotioni earum tam ipse Christus quam postmodum apostoli exhibuerint, sacrae diligenter historiae continent. Legimus[20] in Evangelio murmurantem Pharisaeum, qui hospitio Dominum susceperat, ab ipso esse correptum,[21] et peccatricis mulieris obsequium hospitio eius longe[22] esse praelatum. Legimus[23] et, Lazaro iam resuscitato cum ceteris discumbente, Martham sororem eius solam mensis ministrare, et Mariam copiosi libram unguenti pedibus Dominicis infundere, propriisque capillis ipsos extergere huiusque copiosi unguenti odore domum ipsam impletam[24] fuisse, ac de pretio ipsius, quia tam inaniter consumi videretur, Iudam in concupiscentiam ductum et discipulos indignatos esse. Satagente itaque Martha de cibis, Maria disponit[25] de unguentis; et quem illa reficit interius, haec lassatum fovet[26] exterius.

Nec nisi feminas Domino ministrasse Scriptura commemorat Evangelica, quae proprias etiam facultates in quotidianam eius alimoniam dicarant et ei praecipue huius vitae necessaria procurabant.[27] Ipse discipulis in mensa, ipse in ablutione pedum humillimum se ministrum exhibebat.[28] A nullo vero discipulorum vel etiam virorum hoc eum suscepisse novimus obsequium; sed solas, ut diximus, feminas in his vel ceteris humanitatis obsequiis ministerium impendisse. Et[29] sicut in illo Marthae, ita in isto novimus obsequium Mariae, quae quidem in hoc exhibendo tanto fuit devotior quanto ante fuerat criminosior. Dominus, aqua[30] in pelvim missa, illius ablutionis peregit officium, hoc vero ipsa ei lacrymis intimae compunctionis, non exteriori aqua exhibuit. Ablutos discipulorum pedes linteo Dominus extersit, haec pro linteo capillis usa est. Fomenta unguentorum insuper addidit, quae nequaquam Dominum adhibuisse[31] legimus. Quis etiam ignoret mulierem in tantum de ipsius gratia praesumpsisse ut caput quoque eius superfuso delibuerit unguento? Quod quidem unguentum non de alabastro extractum, sed fracto alabastro memoratur effusum ut nimiae devotionis vehemens exprimeretur desiderium, quae[32] ad nullum[33] ulterius usum illud reservandum censebat, quo in tanto usa sit obsequio. In quo etiam ipsum iam unctionis <effectum>[34] factis ipsis exhibet quem antea Daniel futurum praedixerat,[35] postquam videlicet inungeretur[36] sanctus sanctorum. Ecce enim sanctum sanctorum mulier inungit, et eum pariter hunc esse quem credit,[37] et quem verbis propheta praesignaverat factis ipsa proclamat. Quae est ista, quaeso, Domini benignitas, aut quae mulierum dignitas ut tam caput quam pedes suos ipse nonnisi feminis praeberet inungendos? Quae est ista, obsecro, infirmioris sexus praerogativa, ut summum Christum omnibus Sancti[38] Spiritus unguentis[39] ab ipsa eius conceptione delibutum[40] mulier quoque inungeret, et quasi corporalibus sacramentis eum in regem et sacerdotem consecrans, Christum, id est, unctum corporaliter ipsum efficeret?

Scimus[41] primum a patriarcha Iacob in typum Domini lapidem unctum fuisse,[42] et postmodum regum sive sacerdotum unctiones, seu quaelibet unctionum sacramenta nonnisi viris celebrare permissum est, licet baptizare nonnumquam mulieres praesumant. Lapidem olim patriarcha, templum nunc et altare pontifex oleo sanctificat. Viri itaque sacramenta figuris imprimunt. Mulier vero in ipsa operata est veritate, sicut et ipsa protestatur Veritas, dicens:[43] *Bonum*[44] *opus operata est in me.* Christus ipse a muliere, Christiani a viris inunguntur; caput ipsum, scilicet, a femina, membra a[45] viris. Bene autem effudisse unguentum non stillasse super caput eius mulier memoratur, secundum quod de ipso sponsa in Canticis praecinit, dicens:[46] *Unguentum effusum nomen tuum.* Huius quoque unguenti[47] copiam per illud quod a capite usque ad oram vestimenti defluit[48] Psalmista[49] mystice praefigurat,[50] dicens:[51] *Sicut unguentum in capite quod descendit in barbam, barbam Aaron, quod descendit in oram vestimenti eius.*

---

[20] *Luke* vii, 36 ff.
[21] correctum *CET Amb.*
[22] *om. CEF.*
[23] Cf. *Matt.* xxvi, 6 ff; *Mark* xiv, 3 ff; *John* xii, 1 ff.
[24] repletam *BR.*
[25] disposuit *Amb.*
[26] refovet *Amb.*
[27] ministrabant *CF.* Cf. *Luke* viii, 3.
[28] *John* xiii, 5 ff.
[29] ut *CEF.*
[30] aquam *T.*
[31] exhibuisse *CEF.*
[32] quod *CEF.*
[33] multum *Amb.*
[34] defectum all *Mss.*
[35] *Daniel* ix, 24.
[36] ungeretur *Amb.*
[37] credidit *CEF.*
[38] Spiritus Sancti *Amb.*
[39] ungentis *ART.*
[40] Cf. *Isaias* xi, 2 ff.
[41] Lacuna to priora autem mulieris *CEF.*
[42] *Gen.* xxviii, 18.

Trinam David unctionem, sicut et Hieronymus[52] in psalmo XXVI meminit, accepisse legimus, trinam et Christum sive Christianos. Pedes quippe Domini sive caput muliebre susceperunt unguentum, mortuum vero ipsum Ioseph ab Arimathea[53] et Nicodemus, sicut refert Ioannes,[54] cum aromatibus sepelierunt. Christiani quoque trina sanctificantur unctione, quarum una fit in baptismo, altera in confirmatione, tertia vero infirmorum est. Perpende itaque mulieris dignitatem, a qua vivens Christus bis inunctus,[55] tam in[56] pedibus scilicet quam in capite, regis et sacerdotis suscepit sacramenta. Myrrhae vero et aloes unguentum, quod ad conservanda corpora mortuorum adhibetur, ipsius Dominici corporis incorruptionem futuram praesignabat, quam etiam quilibet electi in resurrectione sunt adepturi.[57] Priora[58] autem mulieris[59] unguenta singularem eius tam regni quam sacerdotii demonstrant dignitatem, unctio quidem capitis superiorem, pedum vero inferiorem. Ecce regis[60] etiam[61] sacramentum a muliere suscipit, qui tamen oblatum a viris sibi regnum suscipere respuit, et ipsis eum in regem rapere volentibus aufugit.[62] Caelestis non terreni regis mulier sacramentum peragit; eius, inquam, qui de semetipso postmodum ait:[63] *Regnum meum non est de hoc mundo.* Gloriantur episcopi cum, applaudentibus populis, terrenos inungunt reges, cum mortales consecrant sacerdotes splendidis et inauratis vestibus adornati. Et saepe his benedicunt quibus Dominus maledicit. Humilis mulier, non mutato habitu, non praeparato cultu, ipsis quoque indignantibus apostolis, haec[64] in Christo sacramenta peragit non praelationis officio, sed devotionis[65] merito. O magnam fidei constantiam! O inaestimabilem caritatis ardorem, quae omnia[66] credit, omnia sperat, omnia sustinet! Murmurat[67] Pharisaeus[68] dum a peccatrice Dominici pedes inunguntur. Indignantur patenter apostoli quod de capite quoque mulier praesumpserit. Perseverat ubique[69] mulieris fides immota, de benignitate Domini[70] confisa, nec ei in utroque Dominicae commendationis desunt suffragia. Cuius quidem unguenta quam accepta, quam grata Dominus habuerit, ipsemet profitetur cum sibi haec reservari postulans indignanti Iudae dixerit:[71] *Sine illam ut in die sepulturae meae servet illud.* Ac si diceret: Ne repellas hoc eius obsequium a vivo, ne devotionis eius exhibitionem in hac quoque re auferas defuncto.

Certum quippe est sepulturae quoque Dominicae sanctas mulieres aromata parasse, quod tunc ista utique minus satageret, si nunc repulsa verecundiam sustinuisset. Qui[72] etiam quasi de tanta mulieris praesumptione discipulis indignantibus, et, ut Marcus meminit,[73] in eam frementibus, cum eos mitissimis fregisset responsis, in tantum hoc extulit beneficium, ut ipsum Evangelio inserendum[74] esse censeret, et cum ipso pariter ubique praedicandum esse praediceret in memoriam, scilicet, et laudem mulieris, quae id fecerit in quo non mediocris arguebatur praesumptionis. Quod nequaquam de aliis quarumcumque personarum obsequiis auctoritate Dominica sic commendatum esse legimus atque sancitum. Qui etiam viduae pauperis eleemosynam omnibus templi praeferens oblationibus, quam accepta sit ei feminarum devotio diligenter ostendit.[75]

---

[43] *Mark* xiv, 6.

[44] opus bonum *ABRT.*

[45] e *BR.*

[46] *Cant.* i, 2.

[47] ungenti *AT.*

[48] defuit *T*] defluxit *Amb.*

[49] psalmus *A*] corrected to psalmus (*s. m.*) *T.*

[50] praefiguravit *A.*

[51] CXXXII, 2.

[52] *Commentarioli in Psalmos* XXVI, edited by Dom Morin (Maredsous, 1895), p. 36; cf. also the spurious work, *Brev. in Psalmos;* PL 26, 948.

[53] Arimathya *T*] Arimathia *ABR Amb.*

[54] *John* xix, 38.

[55] *Luke* vii, 38.

[56] *om. A.*

[57] adepti *Amb.* For myrrh to conserve bodies, cf. St. Ambrose, *Expos. on Luke,* II, 44; CSEL 32, 4, p. 66; PL 15, 1650C.

[58] Priora autem] Haec ergo huius *CEF,* which resume the text here.

[59] Mulieres *Amb.*

[60] rex *CEG.*

[61] *om. CF.*

[62] Cf. *John* vi, 15.

[63] *John* xviii, 36.

[64] *om. CEF.*

[65] dilationis *Fv*] delationis *C* and *E* (corrected to) delectionis *Amb.*] dilectionis *G.*

[66] I *Cor.* xiii, 7.

[67] lacuna to sustinuisset *CEF.*

[68] *Luke* vii, 39.

[69] utique *G.*

[70] *om. BR.*

[71] dixit *Amb. John* xii, 7.

Ausus[76] quidem est Petrus seipsum et coapostolos suos pro Christo omnia reliquisse profiteri, et Zacchaeus[77] desideratum Domini adventum suscipiens, dimidium bonorum suorum pauperibus[78] largitur, et in quadruplum, si quid defraudavit, restituit. Et multi alii maiores in Christo seu pro Christo fecerunt expensas et longe pretiosiora in obsequium obtulerunt divinum vel pro Christo reliquerunt, nec ita tamen Dominicae[79] commendationis laudem adepti sunt sicut feminae. Quarum quidem devotio quanta semper erga eum extiterit, ipse quoque Dominicae vitae exitus patenter insinuat.

Hae quippe, ipso apostolorum principe negante, et dilecto Domini fugiente, vel ceteris dispersis apostolis, intrepidae perstiterunt, nec eas a Christo, vel in passione vel in morte, formido aliqua vel desperatio separare potuit, ut eis specialiter illud[80] Apostoli congruere videatur: *Quis nos separabit a caritate Dei? Tribulatio? an angustia?* etc.[81] Unde Matthaeus, cum de se pariter et ceteris retulisset:[82] *Tunc discipuli omnes, relicto eo, fugerunt*, perseverantiam postmodum supposuit mulierum, quae ipsi etiam crucifixo quantum permittebatur assistebant. *Erant*, inquit,[83] *ibi mulieres multae a longe quae secutae fuerant Iesum a Galilaea, ministrantes ei, etc.*[84] Quas denique ipsius quoque sepulcro immobiliter adhaerentes, idem diligenter evangelista describit, dicens:[85] *Erant autem Maria Magdalene et altera Maria sedentes contra sepulcrum.* De quibus etiam mulieribus Marcus commemorans, ait:[86] *Erant autem et mulieres de longe aspicientes, inter quas erat Magdalene, et Maria Jacobi minoris et Joseph mater, et Salome. Et cum esset in Galilaea sequebantur*[87] *eum et ministrabant ei, et aliae multae quae simul cum eo ascenderant Hierosolymam.*

Stetisse autem iuxta crucem et crucifixo se etiam astitisse Ioannes, qui prius aufugerat, narrat; sed perseverantiam praemittit mulierum quasi earum exemplo animatus esset ac revocatus. *Stabant*,[88] inquit,[89] *iuxta crucem Iesu mater eius, et soror matris eius Maria Cleophae, et Maria Magdalene. Cum vidisset ergo Iesus matrem et discipulum stantem, etc.* Hanc autem sanctarum constantiam mulierum, et discipulorum defectum longe ante beatus Iob in persona Domini prophetavit,[90] dicens: *Pelli meae, consumptibus carnibus, adhaesit os meum et derelicta sunt tantummodo labia circa dentes meos.* In osse quippe, quod carnem et pellem sustentat et gestat, fortitudo est corporis. In corpore igitur Christi, quod est Ecclesia, os ipsius dicitur[91] Christianae fidei stabile fundamentum, sive fervor ille caritatis de quo canitur:[92] *Aquae multae non poterunt extinguere caritatem, etc.*[93] De quo et Apostolus: *Omnia*, inquit,[94] *suffert, omnia credit, omnia sperat, omnia sustinet.* Caro autem in corpore pars interior est, et pellis exterior.

---

[72] qui . . . de] de qua quidem *CEF*, which resume the text here.

[73] *Mark* xiv, 4. et . . . frementibus *om. CEF.*

[74] By correction *T.*

[75] Cf. *Mark* xii, 41-4.

[76] Long lacuna to Hebraeis *CEF. Matt.* xix, 27.

[77] *Luke* xix, 2 ff.

[78] *add* domini *BR.*

[79] domini *A.*

[80] *Romans* viii, 35.

[81] *om. Amb.*

[82] *Matt.* xxvi, 56.

[83] *Matt.* xxvii, 55.

[84] *om. A.*

[85] *Ibid.*, 61.

[86] *Mark* xv, 40-1.

[87] subsequebantur *A.*

[88] *add* autem *ABR.*

[89] *John* xix, 25 ff.

[90] *Job* xix, 20. prophavit *A.*

[91] dixit *T Amb.*

[92] *Cant.* viii, 7.

[93] *omit. Amb.*

[94] *I Cor.* xiii, 7.

Apostoli ergo interiori animae cibo praedicando intendentes, et mulieres corporis necessaria procurantes, carni comparantur et pelli. Cum itaque carnes consumerentur, os Christi adhaesit pelli, quia, scandalizatis in passione Domini apostolis, et de morte ipsius desperatis, sanctarum devotio feminarum perstitit immobilis, et ab osse Christi minime recessit, quia fidei, vel[95] spei, vel caritatis constantiam in tantum retinuit, ut nec a mortuo mente disiungerentur aut corpore. Sunt et viri naturaliter tam mente quam corpore feminis fortiores. Unde et merito per carnem, quae vicinior est ossi, virilis natura; per pellem muliebris infirmitas designatur. Ipsi quoque apostoli, quorum est reprehendendo lapsus aliorum mordere, dentes Domini dicuntur.[96] Quibus tantummodo labia, id est, verba potius quam facta remanserant, cum iam desperati de Christo magis loquerentur quam pro Christo quid operarentur. Tales profecto illi erant discipuli[97] quibus in castellum Emmaus euntibus et loquentibus adinvicem de his omnibus quae acciderant ipse[98] apparuit, et eorum desperationem correxit. Quid denique Petrus vel ceteri discipulorum praeter verba tunc habuerunt, cum ad Dominicam ventum esset passionem, et ipse Dominus futurum eis de passione sua scandalum praedixisset? *Et si omnes,* inquit[99] Petrus *scandalizati fuerint in te, ego numquam scandalizabor.* Et iterum: *Etiam si oportuerit me mori tecum, non te negabo. Similiter et omnes discipuli dixerunt.* Dixerunt, inquam, potius quam fecerunt. Ille[100] primus et maximus apostolorum qui tantam in verbis habuerat constantiam ut Domino diceret:[1] *Tecum paratus sum et in carcerem et in mortem ire*; cui tunc et Dominus ecclesiam suam specialiter committens, dixerat:[2] *Et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos*, ad unam ancillae vocem ipsum negare[3] non veretur, nec semel id agit sed tertio ipsum adhuc viventem denegat; et a vivo pariter omnes discipuli uno temporis puncto fugiendo devolant,[4] a quo nec in morte vel mente vel corpore feminae sunt disiunctae. Quarum beata illa peccatrix, mortuum etiam quaerens et Dominum suum confitens, ait:[5] *Tulerunt Dominum de monumento.* Et iterum:[6] *Si tu sustulisti eum, dicito mihi ubi posuisti eum*[7] *et ego eum tollam.* Fugiunt arietes, immo et pastores Dominici gregis; remanent oves intrepidae. Arguit[8] nos Dominus tamquam infirmam carnem, quod in articulo etiam[9] passionis suae nec una hora cum eo potuerunt vigilare. Insomnem ad sepulcrum illius noctem in lacrymis feminae ducentes, resurgentis gloriam primae[10] videre meruerunt. Cui fideliter in mortem quantum dilexerint[11] vivum, non tam verbis quam[12] rebus exhibuerunt. Et de ipsa etiam, quam circa eius passionem et mortem habuerunt sollicitudinem, resurgentis vita primae sunt laetificatae. Cum enim, secundum Ioannem,[13] Ioseph ab Arimathaea et Nicodemus corpus Domini ligantes linteis cum aromatibus sepelirent, refert Marcus[14] de earum[15] studio quod Maria Magdalene et Maria Ioseph aspiciebant ubi poneretur. De his quoque Lucas commemorat, dicens:[16] *Secutae autem mulieres, quae cum Iesu venerant de Galilaea, viderunt monumentum et quemadmodum positum erat corpus eius et revertentes paraverunt aromata*, non[17] satis videlicet habentes aromata Nicodemi, nisi et adderent sua. Et sabbato quidem siluerunt secundum mandatum; iuxta Marcum[18] vero, cum transisset Sabbatum, summo mane in ipso die resurrectionis venerunt ad monumentum Maria Magdalene et Maria Iacobi et Salome.

---

[95] *om. ABR.*

[96] Cf. Greg. *Moralia* 14, 50, 57, 58; PL 75, 1068-9.

[97] Cf. *Luke* xxiv, 13 ff.

[98] ipsi *Amb.*

[99] *Matt.* xxvi, 33-35.

[100] *add* enim *Amb.*

[1] *Luke* xxii, 33.

[2] *Ibid.* 32.

[3] *Matt.* xxvi, 69 ff.

[4] *Mark* xiv, 50.

[5] *John* xx, 2.

[6] *Ibid.*, 15.

[7] *om. Amb.*

[8] *Matt.* xxvi, 40.

[9] *om. A.*

[10] primo *BR.*

[11] dilixerunt *A.*

[12] quia *G.*

[13] *John* xix, 38-9.

[14] *Mark* xv, 47.

[15] eorum *BR.*

[16] *Luke* xxiii, 55-6.

[17] nec *Amb.*

[18] Cf. *Mark* XVI, 1 ff.

Nunc quoniam devotionem earum ostendimus, honorem quem meruerunt[19] prosequamur. Primo angelica visione sunt consolatae de resurrectione Domini iam completa, demum ipsum Dominum primae viderunt et tenuerunt. Prior quidem Maria Magdalene, quae ceteris ferventior erat, postea ipsa simul et aliae, de quibus scriptum est,[20] quod post angelicam visionem, *exierunt de monumento . . . currentes nuntiare discipulis resurrectionem Domini. Et ecce Iesus occurrit illis, dicens: Avete. Illae autem accesserunt et tenuerunt pedes eius, et adoraverunt eum. Tunc ait illis*[21] *Iesus . . . : Ite, nuntiate fratribus meis ut eant in Galilaeam; ibi me videbunt.* De quo et Lucas prosecutus ait:[22] *Erat Maria*[23] *Magdalene et Ioanna et Maria Iacobi et ceterae, quae cum eis erant, quae dicebant ad apostolos haec.* Quas etiam ab angelo primum fuisse missas ad apostolos nuntiare haec non reticet Marcus, ubi angelo mulieribus loquente scriptum est:[23] *Surrexit, non est hic . . . Sed ite, dicite*[24] *discipulis eius et Petro quia praecedet vos in Galilaeam.* Ipse etiam Dominus primo Mariae Magdalenae apparens ait[25] illi: *Vade ad*[26] *fratres meos, et dic eis: Ascendo ad Patrem meum* etc. Ex quibus colligimus has sanctas mulieres quasi apostolas super apostolos esse constitutas, cum ipsae ad eos vel a Domino vel ab angelis missae summum illud resurrectionis gaudium nuntiaverunt, quod exspectabatur ab omnibus, ut per eas apostoli primum addiscerent quod toti mundo postmodum praedicarent.

Quas etiam post resurrectionem, Domino occurrente,[27] salutari ab ipso evangelista supra memoravit ut, tam occursu suo quam salutatione, quantam erga eas sollicitudinem et gratiam haberet, ostenderet. Non enim aliis proprium salutationis verbum, quod est *Avete*, eum legimus protulisse, immo[28] et a[29] salutatione antea discipulos inhibuisse, cum eis diceret:[30] *Et neminem per viam salutaveritis*, quasi hoc privilegium nunc usque devotis feminis reservaret quod per semetipsum eis exhiberet, immortalitatis gloria iam potitus. *Actus* quoque *Apostolorum*, cum referant statim post ascensionem Domini apostolos a monte Oliveti Hierusalem rediisse et illius sacrosancti conventus religionem diligenter describant, non est devotionis sanctarum mulierum perseverantia praetermissa, cum dicitur:[31] *Hi omnes erant perseverantes unanimiter in orationibus cum mulieribus et Maria matre Iesu.*

Ut[32] autem de Hebraeis praetermittamus feminis quae primo conversae ad fidem, vivente adhuc Domino in carne et praedicante, formam huius religionis inchoaverunt, de viduis quoque Graecorum quae ab apostolis postea susceptae sunt consideremus, quanta scilicet diligentia, quanta cura ab apostolis et ipsae tractatae sint,[33] cum ad ministrandum eis gloriosissimus signifer christianae militiae Stephanus protomartyr cum quibusdam aliis spiritalibus[34] viris ab ipsis apostolis fuerit constitutus. Unde in eisdem Actibus Apostolorum scriptum est:[35] *Crescente numero discipulorum factum*[36] *est murmur Graecorum adversus Hebraeos quod despicerentur in ministerio quotidiano viduae eorum. Convocantes autem duodecim apostoli multitudinem discipulorum, dixerunt: Non est aequum derelinquere*[37] *nos verbum Dei, et ministrare mensis. Considerate ergo, fratres, viros ex omnibus vobis boni testimonii septem, plenos Spiritu Sancto et sapientia, quos constituamus super hoc opus. Nos vero orationi et ministerio verbi instantes erimus. Et placuit sermo coram multitudine, et elegerunt Stephanum, plenum fide et Spiritu Sancto, et Philippum et Prochorum et Nicanorem, et Timotheum*[38]

---

[19] meruerint *Amb.*

[20] *Matt.* xxviii, 8 ff.

[21] *om. Amb.*

[22] *Luke* xxiv, 10.

[23] *Mark* xvi, 6, 7.

[24] discite *T.*

[25] *John* xx, 17.

[26] et *A.*

[27] occurrante *T.*

[28] viro *BR*] uno *T.*

[29] et a] ista *Amb.*

[30] *Luke* x, 4.

[31] Cf. *Acts* i, 14.

[32] ut autem de] multas autem, *CEF* which resume here.

[33] sunt *ACEF.*

[34] Some *Mss* spell this spiritualibus.

[35] *Acts* vi, 1 ff.

[36] factus *AT.*

[37] nos derel. *F Vulg.*

[38] Timonem *F Vulg.*

et Parmenam et[39] *Nicolaum*[40] *Antiochenum. Hos statuerunt ante conspectum apostolorum et orantes imposuerunt eis manus.*

Unde et continentia Stephani admodum commendatur quod ministerio atque obsequio sanctarum feminarum fuerit deputatus. Cuius quidem obsequii[41] ministratio, quam excellens sit, et tam Deo quam ipsis apostolis accepta, ipsi tam propria oratione quam manuum impositione protestati sunt; quasi hos, quos in hoc constituebant, adiurantes ut fideliter agerent, et tam benedictione sua quam oratione,[42] eos adiuvantes ut possent· Quam etiam[43] Paulus administrationem ad apostolatus sui plenitudinem ipse sibi vendicans: *Numquid non habemus*, inquit,[44] *potestatem sororem mulierem circumducendi, sicut et ceteri apostoli?* Ac si aperte diceret: Numquid etiam[45] sanctarum mulierum conventus nos habere ac nobiscum in praedicatione ducere permissum est, sicut ceteris apostolis, ut ipsae videlicet eis in praedicatione de sua substantia necessaria ministrarent? Unde Augustinus in libro *De Opere Monachorum*:

> Ad hoc, inquit,[46] et fideles mulieres habentes terrenam substantiam ibant cum eis, et ministrabant eis de sua substantia, ut nullius indigerent horum quae ad substantiam huius vitae pertinent. Item:[47] Quod quisquis non[48] putat . . . ab apostolis fieri ut cum eis sanctae conversationis mulieres circuirent[49] quocumque Evangelium praedicabant; . . . Evangelium audiant et cognoscant quemadmodum hoc ipsius Domini exemplo faciebant . . . In Evangelio enim scriptum est:[50] *Deinceps et ipse iter faciebat per civitates et castella . . . evangelizans regnum Dei, et duodecim cum illo et mulieres aliquae, quae erant curatae a spiritibus immundis*[51] *et infirmitatibus, Maria quae vocatur Magdalene . . . et Ioanna uxor Chuzae*[52] *procuratoris Herodis, et Susanna, et aliae multae, quae ministrabant ei de facultatibus suis.*

Ut hinc quoque pateat Dominum etiam in praedicatione sua proficiscentem ministratione mulierum corporaliter sustentari et eas ipsi pariter cum apostolis quasi inseparabiles comites adhaerere.

Demum[53] vero huius professionis religione in feminis pariter ut in viris multiplicata, in ipso statim Ecclesiae nascentis exordio aeque sicut viri, ita et feminae propriorum per se monasteriorum habitacula possederunt. Unde et[54] Ecclesiastica Historia laudem Philonis disertissimi Iudaei quam non solum dixit verum etiam magnifice scripsit de Alexandrina sub Marco Ecclesia, ita inter cetera libro secundo, capitulo XVII,[55] commemorat:[56]

> In multis est, inquit, orbis terrae partibus hoc genus hominum. Et post aliqua:[57] Est autem . . . in singulis locis consecrata orationi domus quae appellatur 'semneion'[58] vel monasterium. Item infra:[59] Itaque non solum subtilium intelligunt hymnos veterum, sed ipsi faciunt novos in Deum, omnibus eos et metris et sonis honesta satis et suavi compage modulantes.

Item plerisque de abstinentia eorum[59a] praemissis, et divini cultus officiis adiecit:[60]

---

[39] *om. A.*
[40] *add* advenam *AE Vulg.*
[41] *om. CF.*
[42] *add* sua *BR.*
[43] *add* ut *CE*] et *Amb.*
[44] *I Cor.* ix, 5.
[45] *om. CEF*] et *Amb.*
[46] 4, 5. CSEL 4, 1, p. 538-9; PL 40, 552.
[47] *Op. cit.* 5, 6, p. 539.
[48] putat non potuisse *F* and text of Augustine.
[49] circumirent *Amb.* and text of Augustine.
[50] *Luke* viii, 1 ff.
[51] malignis *Vulg.*
[52] chutae *BR*] chusae *Vulg.*
[53] deinde *BCGR.*
[54] in *CEF.*
[55] XVI *BCEFR Amb.*
[56] Eusebius *Hist. Eccles.* 2, 17. The paraphrase of Rufinus as found in *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte.* Eusebius II Band, I Teil p. 145, l. 15.
[57] *Ibid.*, p. 147, ll. 1-2.
[58] senivor *Amb.* All the *Mss* have a corrupt transliteration of the Greek word *semneion* which Rufinus does not change.
[59] *Ibid.*, p. 149, ll. 3-5.
[59a] *om. Amb.*
[60] *Ibid.*, p. 151, ll. 5-12.

> Cum viris autem, quos dicimus, sunt et feminae in quibus plures iam grandaevae sunt virgines, integritatem et[61] castitatem[62] corporis non necessitate aliqua sed devotione servantes, dum sapientiae studiis semet gestiunt non solum anima,[63] sed et[64] corpore consecrare,[65] indignum ducentes libidini mancipare vas ad capiendam sapientiam praeparatum, et edere mortalem partum eas, a quibus divini verbi concubitus sacrosanctus et immortalis expetitur, ex quo posteritas relinquatur nequaquam corruptelae mortalitatis obnoxia. Item ibidem[66] de Philone: Etiam de conventibus eorum scribit ut seorsum quidem viri seorsum etiam[67] in eisdem locis feminae congregentur et ut vigilias, sicut apud nos fieri moris[68] est, peragant.

Hinc illud est in laude Christianae philosophiae, hoc est monasticae praerogativae, quod et[69] *Tripartita* commemorat *Historia,* non minus a feminis quam a[69a] viris arreptae. Ait[70] quippe sic libro I, capitulo XI:

> Huius elegantissimae philosophiae princeps fuit quidem, sicuti quidam dicunt, Elias[71] propheta et Baptista Ioannes.[72] Philo autem Pythagorius[73] suis temporibus refert undique egregios Hebraeorum in quodam praedio circa stagnum Mariam[74] in colle positum philosophatos. Habitaculum vero eorum et cibos et conversationem talem introducit qualem et nos nunc apud Aegyptiorum monachos esse conspicimus. Scribit[75] eos . . . ante solis occasum non gustare cibum . . . vino semper et sanguinem habentibus abstinere, cibum eis esse panis et salis et hysopi et potum aquae. Mulieres[76] eis cohabitare seniores virgines propter amorem philosophiae spontanea voluntate nuptiis abstinentes.

Hinc et illud est Hieronymi[77] in *Libro de illustribus Viris* capitulo VIII[78] de laude Marci et ecclesiae sic scribentis:

> Primus Alexandriae Christum[79] annuntians constituit ecclesiam tantae doctrinae et vitae continentiae[80] ut omnes sectatores Christi ad exemplum sui cogeret. Denique Philo disertissimus Iudaeorum videns Alexandriae primam ecclesiam adhuc iudaizantem quasi[81] in laudem gentis suae librum super eorum conversione[82] scripsit, et quo modo Lucas narrat Hierosolimae[83] credentes omnia habuisse communia, sic[84] ille quod Alexandriae sub Marco doctore fieri cernebat memoriae tradidit. Item[85] capitulo XI: Philo Iudaeus natione Alexandrinus de genere sacerdotum idcirco a nobis inter scriptores ecclesiasticos ponitur quia librum de prima Marci evangelistae apud Alexandriam scribens ecclesia in nostrorum laude versatus est. Non solum eos ibi, sed in multis quoque provinciis esse commemorans[86] et habitacula eorum dicens monasteria.

Ex quo apparet talem primum Christo credentium fuisse ecclesiam, quales nunc monachi esse imitantur,[86a] et capiunt ut nihil cuiusquam proprium sit, nullus inter eos dives, nullus pauper, patrimonia[87] egentibus dividantur, orationi vacetur et psalmis, doctrinae quoque et continentiae, quales et Lucas refert primum Hierosolimae[88] fuisse credentes.

---

[61] ac *Amb.*
[62] et cast.] casti *Rufinus.*
[63] animo *Rufinus.*
[64] etiam] *CE Amb.*] om. *R.*
[65] consecratae *BRT.*
[66] *Ibid.*, p. 153, ll. 2-4.
[67] om. *CEF*] in eisdem etiam *A.*
[68] mos *Amb.*
[69] *om. F Amb.*
[69a] *om. Amb.*
[70] narrat *F.* CSEL 71, p. 35, ll. 7 ff; PL 69, 897 CD.
[71] Helias *ABCEFRT.*
[72] Iohannes *AR.*
[73] pythagoricus *ACEF Amb.*
[74] marian *AT*] maria *Amb.*
[75] *add* enim *A.*
[76] *add* et ait *CEF.*
[77] Ieronimi *ABRT.*
[78] VII all *Mss. Texte und Untersuchungen,* 14 (1896), p. 12; PL 23, 654.
[79] Christum annuntians] Christianitatis *T.*
[80] continentia *F.*
[81] et *T.*
[82] *sic* all *Mss Amb.*
[83] Hierosolymae *F Amb.*
[84] *add* et *F Amb.*
[85] *op. cit.* p. 14; PL 23, 658.
[86] memorans *F.*
[86a] nituntur *F.*
[87] *add* eorum *CEF.*

Quod si veteres revolvamus historias, reperiemus in ipsis feminas in his quae ad Deum pertinent vel ad quamcumque religionis singularitatem a viris non fuisse disiunctas. Quas etiam pariter ut viros divina cantica non solum cecinisse, verum etiam composuisse sacrae tradunt historiae. Primum quippe canticum de liberatione Israelitici populi non solum viri, sed etiam mulieres Domino decantaverunt hinc statim[89] divinorum officiorum in ecclesia celebrandorum auctoritatem ipsae adeptae. Sic quippe scriptum est:[90] *Sumpsit ergo Maria prophetes*[91] *soror Aaron, tympanum in manu sua; egressaeque sunt omnes mulieres post eam cum tympanis et choris, quibus praecinebat dicens: Cantemus Domino; gloriose enim magnificatus est,* etc.[92] Nec ibi quidem Moyses commemoratur propheta, nec[93] praecinisse dicitur sicut Maria, nec tympanum aut chorum habuisse[94] viri referuntur sicut mulieres. Cum itaque Maria praecinens prophetes[95] commemoratur, videtur ipsa non tam dictando vel recitando quam prophetando canticum istud[96] protulisse. Quae etiam cum ceteris praecinere describitur,[97] quam ordinate sive concorditer psallerent demonstratur. Quod autem non solum voce, verum etiam tympanis et choris cecinerunt,[98] non solum earum maximam devotionem insinuat verum etiam mystice specialis[99] cantici in congregationibus monasticis formam diligenter exprimit. Ad quod et Psalmista nos exhortatur,[100] dicens:[1] *Laudate eum in tympano et choro*, hoc est in[2] mortificatione carnis et concordia illa caritatis de qua scriptum est[3] quia *multitudinis credentium erat cor unum et anima una.*[4] Nec vacat etiam a mysterio quod egressae[5] ad cantandum referuntur,[6] in quo animae contemplativae jubili figurantur; quae dum ad caelestia se suspendit, quasi[7] terrenae habitationis castra[8] deserit et de ipsa contemplationis suae intima dulcedine hymnum spiritalem summa exultatione Domino persolvit. Habemus ibi[9] quoque Debborae[10] et Annae[11] necnon Iudith viduae[12] cantica, sicut et in Evangelio Mariae matris Domini.[13] Quae videlicet Anna Samuelem parvulum suum offerens tabernaculo Domini[14] auctoritatem[15] suscipiendorum infantium[16] monasteriis dedit. Unde Isidorus fratribus in coenobio Honorianensi[17] constitutis, capitulo V:

> Quicumque, inquit,[18] a parentibus propriis in monasterio fuerit[19] delegatus, noverit se ibi perpetuo mansurum. Nam Anna Samuelem puerum Deo obtulit, qui et in ministerio[20] templi quo a matre fuerat[21] functus permansit, et ubi constitutus est deservivit.

Constat etiam filias Aaron pariter cum fratribus suis ad sanctuarium et haereditariam sortem Levi adeo pertinere, ut hinc quoque eis Dominus alimoniam instituterit, sicut scriptum est in libro Numeri, ipso ad Aaron sic dicente:[22] *Omnes primitias sanctuarii, quas offerunt filii Israel Domino, tibi dedi, et filiis ac*

---

[88] Iherosolimae all *Mss.*

[89] statis *T.*

[90] *Exodus* xv, 20.

[91] prophetissa *CF Vulgate.*

[92] *om. CEF Amb.*

[93] *om. T.*

[94] viri hab. *T. Amb.*

[95] prophetissa *F.*

[96] illud *ACEF.*

[97] dicitur *CF.*

[98] cecinerint *C Amb.*] cecinerent *E.*

[99] spiritalis *ACEF Amb.*

[100] hortatur *BR.*

[1] *Psalm* cl, 4.

[2] *om. BR.*

[3] *Acts* iv, 32.

[4] *add* in Domino *F.*

[5] egisse *Amb.*

[6] Cf. *Exodus* xv, 20.

[7] quasi . . . hab. *om. CEF.*

[8] castrum *Amb.*

[9] ibique *C Amb.*

[10] Delborae *CF Amb.*] Deborae *G. Judges* v, 2-31.

[11] *I Kings* ii, 1-10.

[12] *Judith,* xvi, 2-21.

[13] *Luke* i, 46-55.

[14] *I Kings* i, 24 ff.

[15] authoritatem *F Amb.*

[16] infantum *T.*

[17] Honoriacensi *FG.*

[18] Not Isidore but quoted by Smaragdus and Gratian as of Isidore. Cf. *Com. in Reg. S. Bened.* 59; PL 102, 905AB: *Corpus Iuris Can.* (Friedberg, 1879), secunda pars, Causa XX, Questio 1 c, 4, and note.

[19] fuit *T Amb.*

[20] By correction *T.*

[21] *om. T.*

[22] *Numbers* xviii, 19.

filiabus tuis iure perpetuo. Unde nec a clericorum ordine mulierum religio disiuncta videtur. Quas etiam ipsis nomine coniunctas esse constat,[23] cum videlicet tam diaconissas quam diaconos appellemus, ac si in utrisque tribum Levi et quasi Levitas agnoscamus.

Habemus etiam in eodem libro votum illud maximum et consecrationem Nazaraeorum Domini aeque feminis sicut et viris esse institutum, ipso ad Moysen Domino sic dicente:[24] *Loquere ad filios Israel, et dices ad eos: Vir, sive mulier, cum fecerint votum ut sanctificentur et se voluerint Domino consecrare, vino et omni quod inebriare*[25] *potest abstinebunt. Acetum ex vino, et ex qualibet alia potione et quidquid de uva exprimitur non bibent. Uvas recentes siccasque non comedent. Cunctis diebus quibus ex voto Domino consecrantur, quidquid ex vinea est,*[26] *ab uva passa usque ad acinum, non comedent omni tempore separationis*[27] *suae . . .*

Huius quidem religionis illas fuisse arbitror excubantes ad ostium tabernaculi, de quarum speculis Moyses vas composuit in quo lavarentur Aaron et filii eius, sicut scriptum est: Posuit[28] Moyses labrum aeneum in quo lavarentur Aaron et filii eius; quod fecit de speculis mulierum quae excubabant[29] ad ostium tabernaculi. Diligenter magnae devotionis earum fervor describitur, quae clauso etiam tabernaculo foribus eius adhaerentes sanctarum vigiliarum excubias celebrabant, noctem etiam ipsam in orationibus ducentes et ab obsequio divino viris quiescentibus non vacantes. Quod vero clausum eis tabernaculum memoratur, vita poenitentium congrue designatur, qui ut se durius poenitentiae lamentis afficiant a ceteris segregantur. Quae profecto vita specialiter monasticae professionis esse perhibetur, cuius videlicet ordo nihil aliud, esse dicitur quam quaedam parcioris[30] poenitentiae forma. Tabernaculum vero ad cuius ostium excubabant illud est mystice intelligendum, de quo ad Hebraeos Apostolus scribit:[31] *Habemus altare de quo non*[32] *habent edere hi qui tabernaculo deserviunt*; id est, quo participare digni non sunt qui corpori suo, in quo hic quasi in castris ministrant, voluptuosum impendunt obsequium. Ostium vero tabernaculi finis est vitae praesentis, quando hinc[33] anima exit de corpore et futuram ingreditur vitam. Ad hoc ostium excubant qui de exitu huius vitae et introitu futurae solliciti sunt, et sic poenitendo[34] disponunt hunc exitum ut illum mereantur introitum. De hoc quidem quotidiano introitu et exitu sanctae Ecclesiae illa est oratio Psalmistae:[35] *Dominus custodiat introitum tuum et exitum tuum.* Tunc enim simul introitum[36] et exitum nostrum custodit, cum nos hinc[37] exeuntes et iam per poenitentiam purgatos illuc statim introducit. Bene autem prius introitum quam exitum nominavit, non tam videlicet ordinem quam dignitatem attendens, cum hic exitus vitae mortalis[38] in dolore sit, ille vero introitus aeternae summa sit exsultatio. Specula vero earum opera sunt exteriora ex quibus animae turpitudo vel decor diiudicatur, sicut ex speculo corporali qualitas humanae faciei. Ex istis earum speculis vas componitur in quo se abluant Aaron et filii eius, quando sanctarum feminarum opera et tanta infirmi sexus in Deo constantia pontificum et presbyterorum negligentiam vehementer increpant, et ad compunctionis lacrymas praecipue movent. Et si, prout oportet ipsi earum sollicitudinem gerant, haec ipsarum opera peccatis illorum veniam per quam abluantur praeparant. Ex his profecto speculis vas sibi compunctionis beatus parabat Gregorius,[39] cum sanctarum virtutem feminarum et infirmi sexus in martyrio victoriam admirans et ingemiscens quaerebat:

---

[23] cons. cum] constitutum *T.*

[24] *Numbers* vi, 2 ff.

[25] ineb. potest by correction *T.*

[26] esse potest *Vulgate.*

[27] By correction *T.*

[28] Cf. *Exodus* xxx, 18-19, xxxviii, 8. Cf. Greg. *Homilia* 17; PL 76, 1143C ff. apposuit *T Amb.*

[29] excubant *ABRT.*

[30] pressioris *CF.*

[31] *Hebrews* xiii, 10.

[32] non . . . hi] edere non habent potestatem *F Vulg.*

[33] hic *CEF.*

[34] penitndo *T.*

[35] *Psalm* cxx, 8.

[36] *add* tuum *A.*

[37] *om. ABRT.*

[38] mortalitatis *ABR.*

[39] Cf. *Hom. in Evangel,* 11; PL 76, 1116 A.

> Quid barbati dicturi sint[40] viri, cum tanta pro Christo delicatae puellae sustineant et tanto agone sexus fragilis triumphet ut frequentius ipsum gemina virginitatis et martyrii corona pollere noverimus?

Ad has quidem, ut dictum est, ad ostium tabernaculi excubantes et quae iam quasi Nazareae Domini suam ei viduitatem consecraverant beatam illam Annam pertinere non ambigo, quae singularem Domini Nazaraeum Dominum Iesum Christum in templo cum sancto Simeone[41] pariter meruit suscipere et, ut plusquam propheta fieret, ipsum eadem hora qua Simeon per Spiritum agnoscere et praesentem demonstrare ac publice praedicare.[42]

Cuius quidem laudem evangelista diligentius prosecutus ait:[43] *Et erat Anna prophetissa, filia Phanuel, de tribu Aser. Haec processerat in diebus*[44] *multis, et vixerat cum viro suo annis septem a virginitate sua. Et haec vidua erat usque ad annos octoginta quatuor, quae non discedebat de templo ieiuniis et obsecrationibus*[45] *serviens nocte ac die. Et haec,*[46] *ipsa hora superveniens, confitebatur Domino et loquebatur omnibus qui exspectabant redemptionem*[47] *Hierusalem.*[48] Nota singula quae dicuntur et perpende quam studiosus[49] in huius viduae laude fuerit evangelista et quantis praeconiis excellentiam eius extulerit. Cuius quidem prophetiae[50] gratiam quam habere solita erat, et parentem eius, et tribum, et post septem annos quos cum viro sustinuerat longaevum sanctae viduitatis tempus quo se Domino mancipaverat, et assiduitatem eius in templo, et ieiuniorum et orationum instantiam, et[51] confessionem laudis, quas[52] grates Domino referebat, et publicam eius praedicationem de promisso et nato Salvatore diligenter expressit. Et Simeonem quidem iam superius evangelista de iustitia non de prophetia commendaverat, nec[53] in eo tantae continentiae[54] vel abstinentiae virtutem, nec divini sollicitudinem obsequii fuisse memoravit, nec de eius ad alios praedicatione quidquam adiecit.[55]

Huius quoque professionis[56] atque propositi illae sunt verae viduae de quibus ad Timotheum[57] scribens Apostolus ait:[58] *Viduas honora, quae vere viduae sunt.* Item:[59]*Quae autem vere vidua*[60] *est et desolata speret in Deum et instet obsecrationibus et orationibus nocte ac die . . . Et hoc praecipe*[60a] *ut irreprehensibiles sint.*[61] Et iterum:[62] *Si quis fidelis habet viduas, subministret illis, et non gravetur ecclesia,*[63] *ut his quae vere viduae sunt sufficiat.* Veras quippe viduas dicit quae viduitatem suam secundis nuptiis non dehonestaverunt, vel quae devotione magis quam necessitate sic perseverantes Domino se dicarunt. Desolatas[64] dicit quae sic omnibus abrenuntiant ut nullum terreni solatii subsidium retineant, vel qui earum curam agant non habent. Quas quidem et honorandas esse praecipit et de stipendiis Ecclesiae censet sustentari tamquam de propriis redditibus sponsi earum Christi.

Ex quibus etiam quales ad diaconatus ministerium sint eligendae diligenter describit dicens:[65] *Vidua eligatur non minus sexaginta annorum, quae fuerit unius viri uxor, in operibus bonis testimonium habens, si filios educavit, si hospitio suscepit,*[66] *si sanctorum pedes lavit, si tribulationem patientibus subministravit, si omne opus bonum*[67] *consecuta*[68] *est. Adolescentiores autem viduas devita.*

---

[40] sunt *A.*
[41] symeone *CF Amb.*] Syeone *T.*
[42] lacuna to Huius quoque below *CEF.*
[43] *Luke* ii, 36 ff.
[44] By correction *A.*
[45] orationibus *A.*
[46] hac *Amb.*
[47] *om. A.*
[48] Israel *G.*
[49] studiosius *T.*
[50] By correction *T.*] prophetissae *Amb.*
[51] *om. T. Amb.*
[52] qua gratis *A.*
[53] Cf. *Luke* ii, 25.
[54] By correction *A.*
[55] Lacuna ends *CEF.*
[56] perfectionis *FG.*
[57] Thymotheum *T.*
[58] *I Tim.* v, 3.
[59] *Ibid.*, 5.
[60] *om. A.*
[60a] praecipue *BR Amb.*
[61] *add* etc *T.*
[62] *Ibid.*, 7.
[63] vere *CEF.*
[64] dosolatas *T.*
[65] *I Tim.* v, 9-11.
[66] recepit *R Vulgate.*
[67] bonum opus *T Amb.*
[68] subsecuta *Vulgate.*

Quod[69] quidem beatus exponens Hieronymus:[70] "Devita, inquit, <aliis> in ministerio diaconatus praeponere[71] ne malum pro bono detur exemplum." Si videlicet iuniores ad hoc eligantur, quae ad tentationem proniores et natura leviores, nec per experientiam longaevae aetatis providae,[72] malum exemplum his praebeant quibus maxime bonum dare debuerant. Quod quidem malum exemplum in iunioribus viduis, quia iam Apostolus certis didicerat experimentis, aperte profitetur, et consilium insuper adversum hoc praebet cum enim praemisisset: *Adolescentiores autem viduas devita.* Causam[73] huius rei et consilii sui medicamentum statim apposuit, dicens:[74] *Cum enim luxuriatae fuerint in Christo, nubere volunt, habentes damnationem, quia primam fidem irritam fecerunt. Simul*[75] *autem et otiosae*[76] *discunt circumire*[77] *domos; non solum otiosae, sed et verbosae, et curiosae, loquentes quae non oportet. Volo ergo iuniores nubere, filios procreare, matresfamilias esse,*[78] *nullam occasionem dare adversario maledicti gratia. Iam enim quaedam conversae sunt retro Satanam.*

Hanc quoque Apostoli providentiam, de diaconissis scilicet eligendis, beatus Gregorius secutus, Maximo Syracusano episcopo scribit his verbis:[79]

> Iuvenculas abbatissas vehementissime prohibemus. Nullum igitur episcopum fraternitas tua nisi sexagenariam virginem, cuius vita[80] hoc[81] atque mores exegerint, velare permittat.

Abbatissas[82] quippe quas nunc dicimus antiquitus diaconissas vocabant, quasi ministeriales potius quam matres. Diaconus quippe minister interpretatur, et diaconissas ab administratione potius quam praelatione nuncupandas esse censebant, secundum quod ipse Dominus tam exemplis quam verbis instituit, dicens:[83] *Qui maior est vestrum erit minister vester.* Et iterum:[84] *Numquid*[85] *est maior qui recumbit an qui ministrat? Ego autem in medio vestrum sum, sicut qui ministrat,* et alibi:[86] *Sicut Filius hominis non venit ministrari, sed ministrare.* Unde et Hieronymus hoc ipsum nomen abbatis, quo iam gloriari multos noverat, ex ipsa Domini auctoritate non mediocriter ausus est arguere. Qui videlicet eum locum exponens quo[87] scriptum est[88] in epistola ad Galatas:[89] *Clamantes: Abba Pater,*

> Abba, inquit,[90] Hebraicum est, hoc ipsum significans quod pater . . . Cum autem Abba pater Hebraeo Syroque sermone dicatur, et Dominus in Evangelio praecipit[91] nullum patrem vocandum esse nisi Deum, nescio qua licentia in monasteriis vel vocemus hoc nomine alios, vel vocari nos acquiescamus. Et certe ipse praecepit[92] hoc, qui dixerat[93] non esse iurandum; si non iuramus, nec patrem quempiam nominemus. Si de patre interpretabimur aliter, et de iurando aliter sentire cogemur.

Ex his profecto diaconissis Phoeben illam fuisse constat quam Apostolus Romanis diligenter[94] commendans et pro ea exorans ait:[95] *Commendo autem*

---

[69] Lacuna quod . . . causam *CEF*.

[70] A. Souter. *Pelagius' Expositions of The Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul II* (Cambridge, 1926), p. 495; PL 30, 926C. Some *Mss* attribute them to St. Jerome. St. Augustine more than once refers to a commentary of Pelagius, v.g. *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione* III, 1; PL 44, 185. This is the common opinion since the thirteenth century.

[71] *om. Amb.*

[72] *add* et *T.*

[73] *CEF* resume the text.

[74] *I Tim.* v, 11-15.

[75] simul . . . oportet *om. CEF.*

[76] By correction *T.*

[77] circuire *BR Vulg.*

[78] esse matres familias *T.*

[79] *Epistolae* iv, 11; PL 77, 681B; *MGH, Epp.* 1, 245.

[80] vitam *ABRT Amb.*] aetas *F* and text of Greg.] vita *CE.*

[81] *om. Amb.*

[82] I know of no text to support this statement.

[83] *Matt.* xxiii, 11.

[84] *Luke* xxii, 27.

[85] nam quis *F Vulg.*

[86] *Matt.* xx, 28.

[87] quod *CT*] qui *CEF.*

[88] scriptus *FG.*

[89] *Gal.* iv, 6.

[90] ii, 4; PL 26, 400AB.

[91] Cf. *Matt.* xxiii, 9.

[92] praecipit *T.*

[93] Cf. *Matt.* v, 34.

[94] Rom. dil.] dil. Rom. *BCEFR.*

[95] *Rom.* xvi, 2.

vobis Phoeben sororem nostram, quae est in ministerio Ecclesiae, quae est[96] *Cenchris, ut eam suscipiatis in Domino digne sanctis,*[97] *et assistatis ei in quocunque negotio vestri*[98] *indiguerit; etenim ipsa quoque astitit multis, et mihi ipsi.* Quem quidem locum tam Cassiodorus quam Claudius exponentes ipsam illius Ecclesiae diaconissam fuisse profitentur.

> Cassiodorus:[99] Significat, inquit, diaconissam fuisse Matris Ecclesiae quod in partibus[100] Graecorum hodie usque quasi militiae causa peragitur. Quibus et baptizandi usus in Ecclesia non negatur. Claudius:[1] Hic locus, inquit, apostolica auctoritate docet etiam feminas in ministerio Ecclesiae constitui. In quo officio positam Phoeben apud Ecclesiam quae est Cenchris Apostolus magna cum laude et commendatione prosequitur.[2]

Quales etiam ipse ad Timotheum scribens, inter ipsos colligens diaconos,[3] simili[4] morum instructione vitam earum instituit. Ibi quippe ecclesiasticorum ministeriorum[5] ordinans gradus, cum ab episcopo ad diaconos[6] descendisset: *Diaconos*, inquit,[7] *similiter pudicos, non bilingues, non multo vino deditos, non turpe lucrum sectantes, habentes mysterium fidei in conscientia pura. Et hi autem probentur primum, et sic ministrent, nullum crimen habentes. Mulieres*[8] *similiter pudicas esse,*[9] *non detrahentes, sobrias, fideles in omnibus. Diacones*[10] *sint*[11] *unius uxoris viri, qui filiis suis bene praesint et suis domibus. Qui enim bene ministraverint, gradum bonum sibi acquirent et multam fiduciam in fide quae est in Christo Iesu.* Quod itaque ibi de diaconibus dixit, *non bilingues*; hoc de diaconissis dicit, *non detrahentes.* Quod ibi, *non multo vino deditos*; hic dicit *sobrias.* Cetera vero quae ibi sequuntur hic breviter comprehendit dicens: [12]*fideles in omnibus.* Qui etiam sicut episcopos sive diaconos esse prohibet digamos,[13] ita etiam diaconissas unius viri uxores instituit[14] esse ut iam supra meminimus. *Vidua*, inquit,[15] *eligatur non minus sexaginta annorum, quae fuerit unius viri uxor, in operibus bonis testimonium habens; si filios educavit, si hospitio recepit, si sanctorum pedes lavit, si tribulationem patientibus*[16] *subministravit, si omne opus bonum subsecuta est. Adolescentiores autem viduas devita.*[17] In[18] qua quidem diaconissarum descriptione vel instructione quam diligentior fuerit Apostolus, quam in praemissis tam episcoporum quam diaconorum institutionibus facile est assignare. Quippe quod ait, *in operibus bonis testimonium habens*, vel, *si hospitio recepit*, nequaquam in diaconibus memoravit. Quod[19] vero adiecit, *si sanctorum pedes lavit, si tribulationem* etc., tam in episcopis quam in diaconis tacitum est. Et episcopos quidem et diaconos[20] dicit: *nullum crimen habentes.* Istas vero non solum irreprehensibiles esse praecipit,[21] verum etiam *omne opus bonum* subsecutas dicit. Caute[22] etiam de maturitate aetatis earum providit ut in omnibus auctoritatem habeant, dicens: *non minus sexaginta annorum*; et non solum vitae earum, verum etiam aetati longaevae in multis probatae reverentia deferatur. Unde et Dominus licet Ioannem plurimum diligeret, Petrum tamen seniorem tam ipsi quam ceteris praefecit.[23] Minus quippe omnes indignantur seniorem sibi quam iuniorem praeponi, et libentius seniori paremus quem[24] non solum vita priorem verum etiam[25] natura et ordo temporis fecit.

---

[96] *add* in *Amb. Vulg.*

[97] satis, no stroke *A.*

[98] vestro *BRT Amb.*

[99] Probably from his *Com. on Romans*, a lost work. Cf. Manitius, *Gesch. der Lat. Lit. des M.A.* I., p. 50. Lacuna to prosequitur *CEF.*

[100] pactibus *Amb.*

[1] Probably Claudius, bishop of Turin, who had taught in the Palace School under Louis the Pious. His Commentary on the *Romans* has not yet been published. Cf. Manitius, *op. cit.*, pp. 390 ff.

[2] prosequatur *BR.*

[3] diacones *BR.*

[4] sim. morum] in eorum *CEF.*

[5] ministrorum *G.*

[6] diacones *CEFRT.*

[7] *I Tim.* iii, 8-13.

[8] Lacuna to In qua *CE.*

[9] *om. Vulgate.*

[10] diaconi *Vulg.*

[11] By correction T.

[12] *om. Amb.*

[12a] lacuna to In qua *F.*

[13] bigamos *G.* ita et *Amb.*

[14] constituit *BR.*

[15] *I Tim.* v, 9-11.

[16] parentibus *R.*

[17] devita] etc. *A.*] *add* etc. *BR.*

[18] in qua quidem] ubi non tantum *CEF* which resume here, but text is corrupt for several words and then lacuna to caute.

[19] quae *A.*

[20] diacones *A.*

[21] praecepit *A.*

[22] *CEF* resume text.

Hinc et Hieronymus in primo *Contra Iovinianum*,[26] cum de praelatione Petri meminerit:

> Unus, inquit, eligitur ut, capite constituto, schismatis[27] tollatur occasio. Sed cur non Ioannes electus est?[28] Aetati delatum est quia Petrus senior erat ne adhuc adolescens et pene puer progressae aetatis hominibus praeferretur, et magister bonus qui occasionem iurgii debuerat auferre discipulis, . . . in adolescentem quem dilexerat causam praebere videretur invidiae.

Hoc abbas ille diligenter considerabat qui, sicut in *Vitis Patrum*[29] scriptum est, iuniori fratri qui primus ad conversionem venerat primatum abstulit, et maiori eum tradidit hoc uno tantum quia hic illum aetate praecedebat. Verebatur[30] quippe ne ipse etiam frater carnalis indigne ferret iuniorem sibi praeponi. Meminerat[31] ipsos quoque apostolos de duobus ipsorum indignatos esse,[32] cum apud Christum, matre interveniente, praerogativam quamdam affectasse viderentur, maxime cum unus horum esset duorum qui ceteris iunior erat apostolis, ipse videlicet Ioannes de quo modo diximus.

Nec solum in diaconissis instituendis apostolica plurimum invigilaverit cura, verum generaliter erga sanctae professionis viduas quam studiosius[33] extiterit liquet ut omnem amputet tentationis[34] occasionem. Cum enim praemisisset:[35] *Viduas honora quae vere viduae sunt*, statim adiecit: *Si qua autem vidua filios aut nepotes habet, discat primum domum suam regere et mutuam vicem reddere parentibus.* Et post aliqua: *Si quis*, inquit,[36] *suorum*[37] *et maxime domesticorum curam non habet, fidem negavit,*[38] *et est infideli deterior.* In quibus quidem verbis simul et debitae providet humanitati et propositae religioni ne videlicet sub obtentu[39] religionis parvuli deserantur inopes et carnalis compassio erga[40] indigentes sanctum viduae perturbet propositum et retro respicere cogat, et nonnumquam etiam usque ad sacrilegia trahat et aliquid suis porrigat quod de communi defraudet. Unde necessarium praebet[41] consilium, ut, quae domesticorum cura sunt implicitae, antequam ad veram viduitatem transeuntes divinis se penitus obsequiis mancipent, hanc vicem suis parentibus reddant, ut, sicut eorum cura fuerunt educatae, ipsae quoque posteris suis eadem lege provideant. Qui etiam viduarum religionem exaggerans, eas instare praecipit obsecrationibus et orationibus nocte et die. De quarum etiam necessitudinibus admodum sollicitus: *Si quis fidelis, inquit,*[42] *habet viduas, subministret illis et non gravetur Ecclesia ut hic quae vere viduae sunt sufficiat.* Ac si aperte dicat: Si qua est vidua quae tales habeat domesticos qui ei necessaria de facultatibus suis valeant ministrare, ipsi super hoc ei provideant, ut ceteris sustentandis publici sumptus Ecclesiae possint sufficere. Quae quidem sententia patenter ostendit, si qui erga huiusmodi viduas suas obstinati sunt, eos ad hoc debitum ex apostolica auctoritate constringendos esse. Qui non solum earum necessitudini, verum etiam providens honori: *Viduas*, inquit,[43] *honora quae vere viduae sunt.*[44] Tales illas[45] fuisse credimus, quarum alteram ipse matrem,[46] alteram Ioannes evangelista dominam, ex sanctae professionis reverentia vocat:

---

[23] Cf. *Matt.* xvi, 16-19.
[24] quam *A.*
[25] *add* et *C Amb.*
[26] I, 26; PL 23, 258 C ff.
[27] scismatis *AT.*
[28] *add* virgo Text of St. Jerome.
[29] V. *Libell.* X, 113; PL 73. 932 D.
[30] lacuna to illas, below *CEF.*
[31] meminatur *BR.*
[32] Cf. *Matt.* xx, 24 ff; *Mark* x, 35 ff.
[33] Corrected *A*] studiosus *BR.*
[34] occasionis temptationem *BR.*
[35] *I Tim.* v, 3, 4.
[36] *Ibid.* 8.
[37] sanctorum *A.*
[38] negaret *T.*
[39] quod *B.*
[40] *om. BR.*
[41] patet *Amb.*
[42] *I Tim.* v, 16.
[43] *Ibid.* 3.
[44] Close lacuna *CEF.* Tales illas] Huius sancti propositi illas viduas *CEF.*
[45] *om. A.*

Salutate, inquit[47] Paulus ad Romanos scribens, *Rufum electum in Domino, et matrem eius et meam.* Ioannes vero in secunda quam scribit Epistola: *Senior*, inquit,[48] *electae*[49] *dominae, et natis eius* etc. A qua etiam se diligi postulans inferius adiunxit:[50] *Et nunc rogo te domina . . . ut diligamus alterutrum.* Cuius quoque fretus auctoritate beatus Hieronymus, ad vestrae professionis virginem Eustochium scribens, eam appellare dominam non erubuit; immo cur etiam debuerit, statim apposuit, dicens:[51] "Haec idcirco domina mea Eustochium, dominam quippe debeo vocare sponsam Domini mei,[51a] etc." Qui etiam postmodum in eadem epistola huius sancti propositi praerogativam omni terrenae felicitatis gloriae superponens, ait:

> Nolo habeas consortia matronarum, nolo ad nobilium accedas domos, nolo frequenter videas quod contemnens virgo esse voluisti . . . si ad imperatoris uxorem concurrerit[52] ambitio salutantium, cur tu facis iniuriam viro tuo? Ad hominis coniugem sponsa Dei quid properas? Disce in hac parte superbiam sanctam; scito te esse illis meliorem.

Qui etiam ad virginem Deo dicatam scribens de consecratis Deo virginibus, quantam in coelo beatitudinem, et in terra possideant dignitatem, ita exorsus, ait:[53]

> Quantam in coelestibus beatitudinem virginitas sancta possideat, praeter Scripturarum testimonia, Ecclesiae etiam consuetudine edocemur qua addiscimus peculiare illis subsistere meritum quarum spiritalis[54] est consecratio. Nam cum unaquaeque turba credentium paria gratiae dona percipiant,[55] et hisdem omnes sacramentorum benedictionibus glorientur, istae proprium aliquid prae ceteris habent, dum de illo sancto et immaculato Ecclesiae grege quasi sanctiores purioresque hostiae pro voluntatis suae meritis a Spiritu Sancto[56] eliguntur, et per summum sacerdotem Dei offeruntur altario. Item: Possidet ergo virginitas . . . et quod alii non habent, dum . . . et peculiarem obtinet gratiam et proprio, ut ita dixerim, consecrationis privilegio gaudet.

Virginum quippe consecrationem, nisi periculo mortis urgente, celebrari alio tempore non licet quam in Epiphania[57] et Albis Paschalibus et in apostolorum natalitiis; nec nisi a summo sacerdote, id est episcopo, tam ipsas quam ipsarum sacris capitibus imponenda velamina sanctificari. Monachis autem, quamvis eiusdem sint[58] professionis vel ordinis, et dignioris sexus, etiam si sint virgines, qualibet die benedictionem et ab abbate suscipere tam ipsis quam propriis eorum indumentis, id est cucullis, permissum est.

Presbyteros quoque et ceteros inferioris gradus clericos semper in ieiuniis Quatuor Temporum et episcopos omni die Dominico constat ordinari[59] posse. Virginum autem consecratio quanto pretiosior,[60] tanto rarior praecipuarum exsultationem solemnitatum sibi vindicavit.[61] De quarum scilicet[62] virtute mirabili universa amplius congaudet ecclesia, sicut et psalmista praedixerat his verbis:[63] *Adducentur regi virgines post eam*; et rursum: *Afferentur in laetitia et exsul-*

---

[46] Paulus matrem *CEF.*

[47] *Rom.* xvi, 13.

[48] *II John* i, 1.

[49] dilectae *BR.*

[50] *II John* i, 5.

[51] *Ep.* 22, 2; CSEL 54, p. 145; PL 22, 395. consortia] consortium G.

[51a] There is a long lacuna here at the end of folio 37^v in *Ms A* to *ipse tuum*, p. 271.

[52] concurrit *BR.*

[53] Cf. *Virginum Laus*, formerly ascribed to St. Jerome; PL 30, 168.

[54] specialis *BR Text.*

[55] percipient *CEF.*

[56] *add* et *Amb.*

[57] Cf. Gelasius I. *Ep. ad Episcopos Lucianae* 12; PL 59, 52; H. A. Wilson, *The Gregorian Sacramentary* (Henry Bradshaw Society Collection XLIX, London, 1915), pp. 183-4.

[58] By correction *T.*

[59] Cf. Gelasius I. *Ep.* 9, 11; PL 59, 52; Leo I *Ep.* 6, 6; PL 54, 620.

[60] ptetiosior *Amb.*

[61] vendicavit *BT Amb.*

[62] *om. Amb.*

[63] *Psalm* xliv, 15, 16.

tatione, adducentur in templum regis. Quarum[64] etiam consecrationem Matthaeus apostolus simul et evangelista[65] composuisse vel dictasse refertur, sicut in eius passione legitur,[66] ubi et ipse pro earum consecratione vel virginalis propositi defensione martyr occubuisse memoratur. Nullam vero benedictionem vel clericorum vel monachorum apostoli nobis scriptam reliquerunt.[67]

Quarum quoque religio sola ex nomine sanctitatis est insignita cum ipsae a sanctimonia, id est,[68] sanctitate, sanctimoniales sint[69] dictae. Quippe quo infirmior est feminarum sexus,[70] gratior est Deo[71] atque perfectior earum virtus, iuxta ipsius quoque Domini testimonium quo infirmitatem apostoli ad certaminis coronam exhortans ait:[72] *Sufficit tibi gratia mea, nam virtus in infirmitate perficitur.* Qui etiam de corporis sui quod est ecclesia membris per eumdem loquens apostolum, ac si praecipue tam infirmorum membrorum honorem commendaret, in eadem subiunxit epistola, hoc est ad Corinthios prima:[73]

> *Sed multo magis quae videntur membra corporis infirmiora[74] esse necessariora[75] sunt et quae putamus, ignobiliora membra esse corporis his abundantiorem[76] honorem[77] circumdamus et quae inhonesta nostra sunt abundantiorem honestatem habent. Honesta autem[78] nostra nullius egent. Sed Deus temperavit corpus ei cui deerat, abundantiorem tribuendo honorem ut non sit schisma in corpore, sed in idipsum[79] pro invicem sollicita sint[80] membra.*

Quis autem adeo integre per divinae gratiae dispensationem haec[81] in aliquo dixerit[82] adimpleri sicut in ipsa muliebris[83] sexus infirmitate quem[84] tam culpa quam natura contemptibilem fecerat? Circumspice singulos in hoc sexu gradus, non solum virgines ac[85] viduas seu coniugatas, verum etiam ipsas scortorum abominationes, et in eis Christi gratiam videbis ampliorem ut iuxta Dominicam et apostolicam sententiam:[86] *Sint[87] novissimi primi et primi novissimi*; et: *Ubi[88] abundavit delictum superabundet[89] et gratia.*

Cuius quidem divinae gratiae beneficia vel honorem feminis exhibita si[90] ab ipso exordio mundi repetamus, reperiemus statim mulieris creationem[91] quadam praecellere[92] dignitate, cum ipsa scilicet[93] in paradiso, vir extra creatus sit ut hinc praecipue mulieres admoneantur attendere quam sit earum naturalis patria paradisus et quo amplius eas caelibem paradisi vitam sequi conveniat. Unde[94] Ambrosius in libro De Paradiso:[95]

> Et apprehendit, inquit, Deus hominem quem fecit et posuit eum in paradiso . . . vides quoniam qui erat apprehenditur . . . in paradiso eum collocavit . . . adverte quia extra paradisum vir factus est et mulier intra paradisum . . . in inferiori loco vir melior invenitur, et illa quae in meliore loco facta est inferior reperitur.

Prius quoque Dominus Evam totius originem mali restauravit[96] in Maria, quam Adam in Christo reparavit. Et, sicut a muliere culpa, sic[97] a muliere coepit gratia et virginitatis refloruit praerogativa. Ac prius in Anna et Maria viduis et virginibus sanctae professionis forma est[98] exhibita quam in Ioanne vel apostolis monasticae religionis exempla viris proposita.

---

[64] quam *Amb.*
[65] euvangelista *BR.*
[66] Cf. *Acta S. Matthaei* II, 19; *Acta SS.*, Sept. VI, 224.
[67] relinquerunt *T.*
[68] *add* a *BR.*
[69] sunt *B. Amb.*
[70] *add* eo *F.*
[71] *om. T.*
[72] *II Cor.* xii, 9.
[73] *I Cor.* xii, 22.
[74] infirmioris *CET.*
[75] necessaria *BCEFR.*
[76] *add* honestatem *T.*
[77] honestatem *E.*
[78] enim *BR.*
[79] ipsum *BR.*
[80] sunt *BR.*
[81] hoc *CEF.*
[82] duxerit *F.*
[83] muliebri *BR.*
[84] quam *CE.*
[85] aut *BCER.*
[86] Cf. *Matt.* xx, 16.
[87] sunt *B.*
[88] Cf. *Romans* v, 20.
[89] semper abundet *T.*
[90] si . . . exordio *om. BR.*
[91] recreationem *BR.*
[92] praeexcellere *CE.*
[93] quoque *CEFG.*
[94] unde . . . reperitur *om. CEF.*
[95] 4, 24; PL 14, 300B.
[96] By correction *T.*
[97] sic a muliere *om. CEF.*

Quod si post Evam Debborae, Iudith, Esther[99] virtutem intueamur, profecto non mediocrem robori virilis sexus inferemus erubescantiam. Deborra quippe Dominici iudex populi[100] viris deficientibus dimicavit et, devictis hostibus populoque Domini[1] liberato, potenter triumphavit Iudith[2] inermis cum abra sua terribilem exercitum est aggressa et unius[3] Holofernis proprio ipsius[4] gladio caput amputans sola universos stravit hostes et desperatum populum suum liberavit. Esther, spiritu latenter suggerente, contra ipsum etiam legis decretum gentili copulata regi, impiissimi Aman consilium et crudele regis praevenit edictum et[5] constitutam[6] regiae[7] deliberationis sententiam quasi uno temporis momento in contrarium convertit. Magnae ascribitur virtuti quod David[8] in funda et lapide Goliam aggressus est et devicit. Iudith[9] vidua ad hostilem procedit exercitum sine funda et lapide,[10] sine omni adminiculo armaturae dimicatura. Esther[11] solo verbo populum suum[12] liberat et conversa in[13] hostes sententia[14] corruerunt ipsi in laqueum quem tetenderant. Cuius quidem insignis facti memoria singulis annis apud Iudaeos sollemnem meruit habere laetitiam. Quod nequaquam aliqua virorum facta quantumcumque splendida obtinuerunt. Quis incomparabilem matris septem filiorum constantiam non miretur, quos una cum matre apprehensos, sicut Machabaeorum historia narrat[15] rex impiissimus Antiochus ad carnes porcinas contra legem[16] edendas nisus est frustra compellere? Quae maternae[17] immemor naturae et humanae affectionis ignara nec nisi Dominum[18] prae oculis habens quot sacris exhortationibus suis ad coronam filios praemisit tot ipsa martyriis triumphavit, proprio ad extremum martyrio consummata. Si totam Veteris Testamenti seriem[19] revolvamus, quid huius mulieris constantiae comparare poterimus? Ille ad extremum vehemens tentator beati Iob imbecillitatem humanae naturae contra mortem considerans: *Pellem*, inquit,[20] *pro pelle et universa dabit homo pro anima sua.* In tantum enim omnes angustiam[21] mortis naturaliter horremus ut, saepe ad defensionem unius membri, alterum opponamus et pro vita hac conservanda nulla vereamur incommoda.[22] Haec vero non solum sua[23] sed propriam et filiorum animas perdere sustinuit ne unam legis incurreret[24] offensam. Quae est ista, obsecro,[25] ad quam compellabatur transgressio? Numquid abrenuntiare Deo vel thurificare idolis cogebatur? Nihil, inquam,[26] aliud ab eis[27] exigebatur nisi ut carnibus vescerentur,[28] quas lex eis interdicebat.

O fratres et commonachi, qui tam impudenter quotidie contra Regulae institutionem ac vestram[29] professionem ad carnes inhiatis, quid ad huius mulieris constantiam dicturi estis? Numquid tam inverecundi estis ut cum haec auditis erubescentia[30] non confundamini? Sciatis, fratres, quod de regina austri Dominus incredulis exprobrat dicens:[31] *Regina austri surget in iudicio cum generatione*

---

[98] *om. Amb.*
[99] Hester T] Hesther *CF*] Ester *R.*
[100] apostoli *R Amb.*
[1] Dei *FG.*
[2] Cf. *Judith* xiii.
[3] ipsius *CEF.*
[4] *om. CEF.*
[5] *om. BCEFRT Amb.*
[6] constitutamque *F Amb.*
[7] regiaeque *T; add* et *BR.*
[8] *I Kings* xvii, 50.
[9] Cf. *Judith* x.
[10] *add* et *CEF Amb.*
[11] Cf. *Esther* viii.
[12] *om. CF.*
[13] ad *CF.*
[14] sententiam *BCEFR.*
[15] Cf. *II Machabees* vii.
[16] *Ibid.*
[17] mater suae *Amb.*
[18] deum *BCEFRT.*
[19] *om. BR.*
[20] *Job* ii, 29.
[21] angustias *Amb.*
[22] Cf. St. Gregory *Moralia* III, 4; PL 75, 601.
[23] suam *CEF.*
[24] occurreret *BR.*
[25] *om. F.*
[26] By correction *T*] inquit BR, aliud *om. Amb.*
[27] ab eis *om. BR.*
[28] vesceretur *BR.* Cf. *II Mach.* vii, 1.
[29] nostram *Amb.*
[30] erubescentiam *CE Amb.*
[31] *Matt.* xii, 42.

ista et condemnabit eam, multo amplius vobis de huius mulieris constantia improperandum esse,[32] quae et longe maiora fecerit et vos vestrae professionis[33] voto religioni[34] arctius[35] astricti estis. Cuius quidem tanto agone virtus examinata hoc in Ecclesia privilegium obtinere meruit ut[36] eius martyrium solemnes lectiones atque missam habeat; quod nulli antiquorum sanctorum concessum est, quicunque scilicet adventum Domini moriendo praevenerunt, quamvis in ipsa Machabaeorum historia Eleazarus ille venerabilis senex unus de primoribus Scribarum eadem causa martyrio iam coronatus fuisse referatur.[37]

Sed[38] quia, ut diximus, quo naturaliter femineus sexus est infirmior, eo virtus eius[39] est Deo acceptabilior et honore dignior, nequaquam martyrium illud in festivitate memoriam meruit cui femina non interfuit; quasi pro magno non habeatur, si fortior sexus fortiter patiatur. Unde et in laude praedictae feminae amplius Scriptura prorumpens ait:[40] *Supra modum autem mater mirabilis et bonorum memoria digna, quae pereuntes septem filios sub unius diei tempore conspiciens bono animo ferebat propter spem quam in Deo*[41] *habebat. Singulos illorum*[42] *hortabatur fortiter, repleta sapientia et femineae cogitationi masculinum animum inserens.*

Quis in laudem virginum unicam[43] illam Iephte filiam assumi non censeat;[44] quae ne voti licet improvidi reus pater haberetur et divinae gratiae beneficium promissa fraudaretur hostia, victorem patrem in iugulum proprium animavit.[45] Quid haec,[46] quaeso,[47] in agone martyrum factura esset, si forte ab infidelibus negando Deum apostatare cogeretur? Numquid interrogata de Christo cum illo iam apostolorum principe diceret:[48] *Non novi illum*? Dimissa per duos menses a patre libera, his completis,[49] redit[50] ad patrem occidenda. Sponte morti se ingerit et eam magis provocat quam veretur. Stultum patris plectitur votum, et paternum redimit mendacium[51] amatrix maxima veritatis. Quantum hunc in se[52] lapsum abhorreret quem in patre non sustinet? Quantus hic est virginis fervor tam in carnalem quam in coelestem patrem? Quae simul morte sua et hunc[53] a mendacio liberare et illi[54] promissum decrevit conservare. Unde merito tanta haec puellaris animi fortitudo praerogativa quadam id meruit obtinere ut per annos singulos filiae Israel in unum convenientes quasi quibusdam solemnibus hymnis festivas virginis agant exequias, et de passione virginis compunctae piis planctibus compatiantur.[55]

Ut autem cetera omnia praetermittamus, quid tam necessarium nostrae redemptioni et totius mundi saluti fuerit[56] quam sexus femineus, qui nobis ipsum peperit Salvatorem? Cuius quidem honoris singularitatem mulier illa quae prima irrumpere ausa est ad beatum Hilarionem illi admiranti opponebat dicens:[57]

> Quid avertis[58] oculos? Quid rogantem fugis? Noli me[59] mulierem aspicere, sed miseram. Hic sexus genuit Salvatorem.[60]

Quae gloria huic poterit comparari quam in Domini matre adeptus est sexus iste? Posset utique, si vellet, redemptor noster de viro corpus assumere[61] sicut primam feminam de corpore viri voluit formare. Sed hanc suae humilitatis singularem gratiam ad infirmioris sexus transtulit honorem. Posset[62] et alia parte muliebris corporis digniore nasci quam ceteri homines, eadem qua concipiuntur vilissima portione nascentes. Sed ad incomparabilem infirmioris corporis honorem longe amplius ortu suo consecravit eius genitale, quam viri fecerat ex circumcisione.

---

[32] est *CEF*.
[33] religionis *CEF*.
[34] *om. CEF*] religionis *R*.
[35] artius *T*.
[36] et *BR*.
[37] Cf. *II Mach.* vii, 18 ff.
[38] sed . . . inserens *om. CEF*.
[39] Deo est *T*.
[40] Cf. *II Mach.* vii, 20-21.
[41] Domino *BR Amb*.
[42] eorum *BR*.
[43] unicam *Amb*.
[44] Cf. *Judges* xi, 30 ff.
[45] animadvertit *F*.
[46] hoc *BER*.
[47] *om. CEF*.
[48] *Luke* xxii, 57.
[49] expletis *CEF*.
[50] rediit *CF*.
[51] mandatium *T*] mandatum *Amb*.
[52] hunc in se] habuisse *BR*.
[53] illum *F*.
[54] huic *F*.
[55] Cf. *Judges* xi, 39-40.
[56] fuit *CEF*.
[57] St. Jerome *Life of St. Hilarion*, 13; PL 23, 34C.
[58] advertis *BR*.
[59] *om F*.
[60] salvator *CEF*.
[61] Cf. St. Augustine *Sermones*, 51, 2; PL 38, 334.

Atque ut[63] hunc singularem virginum nunc omittam honorem, libet ad ceteras quoque feminas sicut proposuimus stilum convertere. Attende itaque quantam statim gratiam adventus Christi Elisabeth coniugatae, quantum exhibuit Annae viduae. Virum[64] Elizabeth Zachariam magnum Domini sacerdotem incredulitatis[65] diffidentia mutum adhuc tenebat, dum in adventu et salutatione Mariae ipsa mox Elisabeth Spiritu Sancto repleta et exsultantem in utero suo parvulum sensit et, prophetiam iam de ipso completo Mariae conceptu prima proferens, plusquam propheta extitit.[66] Praesentem quippe illico virginis conceptum nuntiavit, et ipsam Domini matrem ad magnificandum super hoc ipso Dominum concitavit. Excellentius autem[67] prophetiae donum in Elizabeth videtur completum,[68] conceptum statim Dei Filium agnoscere, quam in Ioanne ipsum iamdudum natum ostendere. Sicut igitur Mariam Magdalenam apostolorum dicimus apostolam, sic nec istam prophetarum dicere dubitemus prophetam sive[69] ipsam beatam viduam Annam de qua supra latius actum est.[70]

Quod si hanc prophetiae gratiam usque ad gentiles etiam extendamus, Sibylla[71] vates in medium procedat et quae ei de Christo revelata sunt proferat. Cum qua si universos conferamus prophetas, ipsum etiam Isaiam, qui, ut Hieronymus asserit,[72] non tam propheta quam evangelista dicendus est, videbimus in hac quoque gratia feminam viris longe praestare. De qua Augustinus contra quinque[73] hereses testimonium proferens ait:[74]

> Audiamus quid etiam[75] Sibylla vates eorum de eodem dicat: Alium, inquit, dedit Dominus hominibus fidelibus colendum . . . Item . . . : Ipse[76] tuum cognosce Dominum Dei Filium esse. Alio loco Filium Dei symbolum[77] appellat, id est consiliarium vel consilium.[78] Et propheta dicit:[79] *Vocabunt*[80] *nomen eius admirabilis, consiliarius.*

De qua rursus idem pater Augustinus in decimo octavo De Civitate Dei:[81]

> Eo, inquit, tempore nonnulli Sibyllam Erythraeam[82] vaticinatam ferunt . . . , quam quidam magis credunt[83] esse Cumanam;[84] . . . et sunt eius viginti et septem versus . . . qui . . . sicut eos quidam Latinis . . . versibus est interpretatus, hoc continent:

---

[62] Cf. St. Augustine *De Genesi ad Litt.*, 9, 16, 30; CSEL 28, 3, 2. p. 290; PL 34, 405.

[63] in *T.*

[64] virum . . . concitavit *om. CEF.*

[65] incrudelitatis *T.*

[66] Cf. *Luke* i, 5, ff.

[67] enim *CEF.*

[68] *om. BCEFR.*

[69] sive . . . est *om. CEF.*

[70] see above.

[71] Sibilla AT. There were Sibylline Oracles composed by pagans and also those by Jews and Christians. Those by the Jews date from about the second century B.C.; those by the Christians from the second or third centuries. The latter were much used by Lanctantius as well as by St. Augustine. Cf. H. Diels, *Sybillinische Blätter* (Berlin, 1890); J. Geffchen, *Die Oracula Sybillina* in *Die Griechischen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig, 1902); O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der Altkirchen Literatur* II, 708ff: *Texte und Untersuchungen* 23 (Leipzig, 1902).

[72] Cf. *Com. in Isaiam Prophetam, Prologus;* PL 24, 18; *Praefatio in Librum Isaiae;* PL 28, 825 B; St. Augustine, *De Civ. Dei* XVIII, 29; CSEL 40, 5, lb, p. 306; PL 41, 85.

[73] *om. Amb.*

[74] PL 42, 1103. Spurious.

[75] *om. BCER.*

[76] ipsum *G. Ms A* resumes.

[77] simbolon *T*] simbolum *R*] in Greek *F.*

[78] *om. Amb.*

[79] Cf. *Isaias* ix, 6.

[80] vocabitur *F.*

[81] Cf. 18, 23 ff; CSEL 40, 5, lb, p. 299; PL 41, 580.

[82] Erecteam *A*] corrupt *BR*]Ericteam by correction *T.*

[83] credebant *CF.*

[84] Cumaeum *Text.*

Iudicii signum, tellus[85] sudore madescet.
E caelo rex adveniet per saecla futurus,
Scilicet in carne praesens ut iudicet orbem etc.[86]

> Quorum quidem versuum primae litterae in Graeco coniunctae id sonant: Iesus Christus Filius Dei Salvator. Infert etiam Lactantius[87] . . . quaedam de Christo vaticinia Sibyllae . . . : In manus, inquit, infidelium postea veniet; dabunt . . . Deo alapas manibus incestis et impurato[88] ore expuent venenatos sputos; dabit vero[89] ad verbera suppliciter sanctum dorsum. Et colaphos accipiens tacebit, ne quis agnoscat quod verbum vel unde venit,[90] ut[91] inferis loquatur, et spinea corona coronetur.[92] Ad cibum autem fel et ad sitim acetum dederunt; <inhospitalitatis>[93] hanc monstrabunt mensam. Ipsa[94] enim insipiens gens tuum Deum[95] non intellexisti, ludentem[96] mortalium mentibus, sed spinis coronasti, fel miscuisti. Templi velum scindetur et in medio die nox erit . . . tribus horis; et morietur tribus diebus somno suscepto, et tunc ab inferis regressus ad lucem veniet primus resurrectionis principio . . . ostensus.

Hoc profecto Sibyllae vaticinium, ni fallor,[97] maximus ille poetarum nostrorum Virgilius[98] audierat atque attenderat, cum in quarta Ecloga[99] futurum in proximo sub Augusto Caesare, tempore consulatus Pollionis, mirabilem cuiusdam pueri de caelo ad terras mittendi, qui etiam peccata mundi tolleret et quasi saeculum novum in mundo mirabiliter ordinaret, praecineret ortum; admonitus, ut ipsemet ait, Cumaei carminis vaticinio, hoc est, Sibyllae[100] quae Cumaea[1] dicitur. Ait quippe sic quasi adhortans quoslibet ad congratulandum sibi et concinendum seu scribendum de hoc tanto puero nascituro in comparatione cuius omnes alias materias quasi infimas[2] et viles reputat, dicens:

Sicelides Musae, paulo maiora canamus!
Non omnes arbusta iuvant humilesque mericae
. . . Ultima Cumaei venit iam carminis aetas,
Magnus ab integro saeclorum nascitur ordo.
Iam redit et virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna,
Iam nova progenies coelo demittitur alto. etc.

Inspice singula Sibyllae dicta et quam integre et aperte Christianae fidei de Christo summam[3] complectatur. Quae nec divinitatem eius nec humanitatem, nec utrumque ipsius adventum, nec utrumque iudicium prophetando vel scribendo praetermisit; primum quidem iudicium quo iniuste iudicatus est in passione et secundum quo iuste iudicaturus est mundum in maiestate. Quae, nec descensum eius ad inferos nec resurrectionis gloriam praetermittens, non solum[4] prophetas verum etiam ipsos supergressa videtur evangelistas, qui de hoc eius descensu minime scripserunt.

Quis non etiam illud tam familiare prolixumque colloquium[5] miretur, quo ipse solus solam illam gentilem et Samaritanam mulierem tam diligenter dignatus est instruere, de quo et ipsi vehementer obstupuerunt apostoli? A[6] qua etiam infideli et de virorum suorum multitudine reprehensa, potum ipse voluit[7] postulare, quem nihil ulterius alimenti ab aliquo novimus requisisse. Superveniunt apostoli et emptos ei cibos offerunt, dicentes:[8] *Rabbi, manduca*: nec oblatos suscipi videmus, sed hoc quasi in excusationem[9] ipsum praetendisse:[10] *Ego cibum habeo manducare, quem vos nescitis.* Potum ipse a muliere postulat; a quo se illa excusans beneficio: *Quomodo*, inquit, *tu*,[11] *Iudaeus cum sis, bibere a me poscis, quae sum mulier Samaritana? Non enim coutuntur Iudaei Samaritanis.* Et iterum:[12] *Neque in quo haurias habes, et puteus altus est.* Potum itaque a muliere infideli et id negante desiderat, qui oblatos ab apostolis cibos non curat.

---

[85] stellus *T.*

[86] *om. F Amb.*

[87] Lactantius *ABERT*. Cf. *Div. Inst.* IV, 18 ff.; CSEL 19. 1, p. 352 ff.; PL 6, 505 ff.

[88] impuro *G.* expuerint *A.*

[89] Deus *CEF.*

[90] venerit *Amb.*

[91] vel *CEF.*

[92] coronatur *T*] coronabitur *CEF Amb.*

[93] inhospitalitatem *ABRT Amb.*] et cetera multa *CE.*

[94] *om.* to ostensus *CF.*

[95] *add* gentium deum *R.*

[96] laudentem *T*] laudandum *Amb.*

[97] nisi *CF.*

[98] For the use of Vergil's fourth Eclogue by early writers, cf. The Address of Constantine XIX, Eusebius *Eccles. Hist.; Die Griechischen Schriftsteller, Eusebius,* Band I, pp. 181-7; PG 20, 1290 ff. Lactantius. *Div. Inst.* VII. 24; PL 6, 708 ff; St. Augustine *Epp.* 137, 12; CSEL 34, 2, p. 114; PL 33, 521; *De Civ.* Dei X, 27; CSEL 40, p. 493; PL 41, 305. St. Jerome denied that the Eclogue refers to Christ. *Epp.* 53, 7; CSEL 54, 1, 1, p. 454; PL 22, 545.

[99] egloga *RT.*

[100] sibilla *AFRT.*

[1] Cumea *A*] Cumena *BRT*] Cumana *Amb.*

[2] infirmas *CEG.*

[3] summa *CF.*

[4] nec *CEF.*

[5] Cf. *John* iv, 7 ff.

Quae est ista, quaeso, gratia quam exhibet infirmo sexui ut videlicet a muliere hac postulet aquam qui omnibus tribuit vitam? Quae, inquam, nisi ut patenter insinuet tanto sibi mulierum virtutem esse gratiorem, quanto earum natura esse constat infirmiorem, et se tanto amplius earum salutem desiderando sitire, quanto mirabiliorem earum virtutem constat esse? Unde et[13] cum a femina potum postulat, huic praecipue siti suae per salutem feminarum satisfieri velle se insinuat· Quem potum etiam cibum[14] vocans: *Ego*, inquit,[15] *cibum habeo manducare, quem vos nescitis.* Quem postmodum exponens cibum adiungit: *Meus cibus est ut faciam voluntatem Patris mei*; hanc videlicet quasi singularem sui Patris voluntatem esse innuens ubi de salute agitur infirmioris sexus.[16] Legimus et familiare colloquium cum Nicodemo illo Iudaeorum principe Dominum habuisse quo illum quoque ad se occulte venientem de salute sua ipse instruxerit,[17] sed illius colloquii non tantum hunc[18] fructum esse consecutum.[19] Hanc quippe Samaritanam et spiritu prophetiae repletam esse tunc constat quo videlicet Christum et ad Iudaeos iam venisse et ad gentes venturum esse professa est, cum dixerit:[20]*Scio quia Messias venit, qui dicitur Christus*; *cum ergo venerit ille, nobis annuntiabit*[21] *omnia.* Et multos ex civitate illa propter verbum mulieris ad Christum cucurrisse et in eum credidisse, et ipsum duobus diebus apud se retinuisse qui tamen alibi discipulis ait:[22] *In viam gentium ne abieritis et in civitates Samaritanorum ne intraveritis.* Refert alibi[23] idem Ioannes quosdam ex gentilibus, qui ascenderant Hierosolymam ut adorarent in die festo, per Philippum[24] et Andream Christo nuntiasse quod eum vellent videre. Nec[25] tamen eos esse admissos commemorat nec illis postulantibus tantam Christi copiam esse concessam quantam huic Samaritanae nequaquam id petenti, a qua eius in gentibus praedicatio coepisse videtur quam non solum converterit, sed per eam, ut dictum est,[26] multos acquisivit. Illuminati statim per stellam Magi et ad Christum conversi nullos exhortatione sua vel doctrina ad eum traxisse referuntur,[27] sed soli accessisse.[28] Ex quo etiam liquet quantam a Christo gratiam in gentibus mulier sit adepta quae, praecurrens et civitati nuntians eius adventum et quae audierat praedicans, tam propere[29] ipsa multos de populo suo est lucrata.

Quod si Veteris Testamenti vel evangelicae Scripturae paginas revolvamus, summa illa de resuscitatis mortuis beneficia divinam gratiam feminis praecipue videbimus impendisse, nec nisi ipsis vel de ipsis haec miracula facta fuisse. Primo quippe per Eliam[30] et Elisaeum ad intercessionem matrum filios ipsarum resuscitatos et[31] eis redditos esse legimus. Et Dominus ipse viduae[32] cuiusdam filium suum et archisynagogi filiam[33] et rogatu sororum Lazarum resuscitans[34] hoc immensi miraculi beneficium maxime feminis impendit. Unde illud est Apostoli ad Hebraeos scribentis:[35] *Acceperunt mulieres de resurrectione mortuos suos.* Nam[36] et puella suscitata[37] mortuum recepit corpus et ceterae feminae in consolationem sui quos plangebant mortuos receperunt suscitatos.[38] Ex quo etiam liquet quantam semper feminis exhibuerit gratiam quas tam sua quam suorum resuscitatione primo laetificans, novissime quoque ipse propria resurrectione[39] eas plurimum extulit quibus, ut dictum est, primum apparuit.[40] Quod etiam hic sexus in populo persequente, quodam erga Dominum naturali compassionis affectu, visus est promereri; ut enim Lucas meminit, cum eum viri ad crucifigendum ducerent, feminae ipsorum sequebantur plangentes ipsum atque lamentantes. Quibus ipse conversus et quasi pietatis huius vicem in ipso statim passionis articulo misericorditer eis referens, futurum, ut cavere queant, praedicit,[41] exitum:[42] *Filiae, inquit, Hierusalem*[43] *nolite flere super me sed super vos ipsas flete et super filios vestros. Quia ecce venient dies, in quibus dicent: Beatae steriles, et ventres quae non genuerunt* etc.[44] Ad cuius etiam liberationem iniquissimi iudicis uxorem antea fideliter laborasse Matthaeus commemorat dicens:[45] *Sedente autem illo pro tribunali, misit ad illum uxor eius dicens: Nihil tibi et iusto illi; multa enim passa sum hodie per visum propter eum.* Quo etiam praedicante, solam feminam de tota turba in tantam eius laudem legimus[46] extulisse vocem ut beatum exclamaret uterum qui eum portaverit, et ubera quae suxerit.[47] A quo et statim piam confessionis suae, licet verissimae, correctionem[48] meruit audire, ipso confestim ei respondente: *Quinimmo beati qui audiunt verbum Dei et custodiunt illud.*

---

[6] A . . . sexus *om. CF* (to ex quo *E*).
[7] *John* iv, 7.
[8] *John* iv, 31.
[9] excus . . . credidit *om. BR.*
[10] *John* iv, 32.
[11] *Ibid.*, 9.
[12] *Ibid.*, 11.
[13] corrected *A.*
[14] cybum *A.*
[15] *John* iv. 32, 34.
[16] Close lacuna *CEF.*
[17] instruxit *CEF.*
[18] tunc *A.*
[19] consequuntur *T*; lacuna to ex quo liquet *CEF.*
[20] *John* iv, 25.
[21] annunciabit *Amb.*
[22] *Matt.* x, 5.
[23] Cf. *John* xii, ff.
[24] phylippum *T.*
[25] non *Amb.*
[26] *John* iv, 41.
[27] *Matt.* ii, 12.
[28] accessione *A.* Close lacuna *CEF.*
[29] ista *Amb.*
[30] Helysaeum *AT.* Cf. *III Kings* xvii, 22; *IV Kings* iv, 22 ff.

Solus Ioannes inter apostolos Christi hoc privilegium amoris obtinuit ut dilectus Domini vocaretur. De Martha autem et Maria[49] ipse scribit Ioannes: *quia diligebat Iesus Martham et sororem eius Mariam et Lazarum.* Ipse idem apostolus, qui ex[50] privilegio, ut dictum est, amoris se unum a Domino dilectum esse commemorat, hoc ipso privilegio quod nulli aliorum ascripsit apostolorum, feminas insignivit. In quo etiam honore, cum[51] etiam[52] fratrem earum ipsis aggregaret, eas tamen illi praeposuit quas in amore praecellere credidit.[53]

Libet denique, ut ad fideles[54] seu Christianas redeamus feminas et[55] divinae respectum[56] misericordiae in ipsa etiam publicorum abiectione scortorum et stupendo praedicare et praedicando stupere. Quid enim[57] abiectius quam Maria Magdalene vel Maria Aegyptiaca secundum vitae statum pristinae? Quas vero postmodum vel honore vel merito divina amplius gratia sublimavit; illam quidem quasi in apostolico permanentem coenobio, ut iam supra commemoravimus, hanc[58] vero, ut scriptum est, supra humanam virtutem anachoretarum[59] agone dimicantem,[60] ut in utrorumque monachorum proposito sanctarum virtus feminarum praemineat, et illud quod incredulis ait[61] Dominus: *meretrices praecedent vos in regnum Dei* ipsis etiam[62] fidelibus viris improperandum[63] videatur, et secundum sexuum seu vitae differentiam fiant novissimi primi et primi novissimi. Quis denique ignoret feminas exhortationem Christi et consilium apostoli tanto castimoniae zelo esse complexas ut pro conservanda carnis pariter ac mentis integritate Deo se per[64] martyrium[65] offerrent holocaustum, et gemina triumphantes corona agnum sponsum virginum quocumque ierit sequi studerent?[66] Quam quidem virtutis perfectionem raram in viris, crebram in feminis esse cognovimus. Quarum etiam nonnullas tantum in hac carnis praerogativa zelum habuisse legimus ut non sibi manum inferre dubitarent ne quam Deo voverant incorruptionem amitterent, et ad sponsum virginem[67] non[68] virgines pervenirent. Qui etiam sanctarum devotionem virginum in tantum sibi gratam esse monstravit ut gentilis[69] populi multitudinem ad beatae Agathae suffragium concurrentem velo eius contra aestuantis Aethnae terribilem ignem opposito[70] tam a corporis quam animae liberaret[71] incendio. Nullam novimus monachi cucullam beneficii tanti gratiam esse adeptam. Legimus quidem ad tactum pallii Eliae[72] Iordanem esse divisum, et ipsi pariter et Elisaeo viam per terram praebuisse, velo autem virginis immensam adhuc[73] infidelis[74] populi[75] multitudinem tam mente salvari quam corpore, et sic eis conversis ad coelestia viam patuisse. Illud quoque non modicum sanctarum dignitatem commendat feminarum, quod in suis ipsae[76] verbis consecrantur, dicentes: *anulo*[77] *suo subarravit me etc.*;[78] *ipsi sum desponsata* etc. Haec quippe verba sunt beatae Agnetis in quibus virgines suam professionem facientes Christo desponsantur.

---

[31] et eis redditos *om. Amb.*
[32] quod *CEF* Cf. *Mark* v, 42.
[33] Cf. *Luke* vii, 12.
[34] Cf. *John* xi, 44.
[35] Cf. *Hebrews* xi, 35.
[36] Lacuna *CEF.*
[37] resuscitata *A.*
[38] Close lacuna *EF.*
[39] Close lacuna *C.*
[40] Cf. *Matt.* xxviii, 9. Open lacuna *CEF.*
[41] praedixit *A.* *Luke* xxiii, 28, 29.
[42] exitium *G.*
[43] Hierosolymam *T.*
[44] *om. Amb.*
[45] *Matt.* xxvii, 19.
[46] Cf. *Luke* xi, 27.
[47] sugserit *T*] sugessit by correction *A.*
[48] correptionem *A.*
[49] ex Maria *T.*
[50] By correction *T.*
[51] *om. T Amb.*
[52] etsi *Amb.*
[53] Close lacuna *BCEFR.*
[54] Christianas seu fideles *F.*
[55] *om. BRT Amb.*
[56] respectu *ER*] iudicium *CF.*
[57] etiam *T.*] est *Amb.*
[58] hac *Amb.* Cf. *Vitae Patrum;* PL 73, 671 ff.
[59] anchoritarum *A.*
[60] dimicante *BRT Amb.*
[61] *Matt.* xxi, 31.
[62] et *Amb.*
[63] *add* esse *CEF.*

Si[79] quis etiam vestrae[80] religionis formam ac dignitatem apud Gentiles cognoscere curet, atque nonnulla inde quoque exempla ad exhortationem vestram inducere, facile deprehendet in ipsis etiam nonnullam huius propositi institutionem praecessisse, excepto quod ad fidei pertinet tenorem, et multa in illis sicut et in Iudaeis praecessisse, quae ex utrisque congregata ecclesia retinuit, sed in melius commutavit. Quis enim[81] nesciat universos clericorum ordines ab ostiario usque ad Episcopum, ipsumque tonsurae usum ecclesiasticae, qua clerici fiunt, et ieiunia quattuor Temporum, et azymorum sacrificium, nec non ipsa sacerdotalium indumentorum ornamenta, et nonnulla dedicationis vel alia sacramenta a synagoga ecclesiam assumpsisse? Quis etiam ignoret ipsam,[82] utillissima dispensatione, non solum saecularium dignitatum gradus in regibus ceterisque principibus, et nonnulla legum decreta vel philosophicae disciplinae documenta in conversis gentibus retinuisse, verum etiam quosdam ecclesiasticarum dignitatum gradus, vel continentiae formam et corporalis munditiae religionem ab eis accepisse. Constat quippe nunc episcopos vel archiepiscopos praesidere ubi tunc flamines vel archiflamines habebantur, et quae tunc templa daemonibus sunt instituta, postea Domino fuisse consecrata et sanctorum memoriis insignita. Scimus[83] et in gentibus praecipue praerogativam virginitatis enituisse, cum maledictum legis ad nuptias Iudaeos coerceret,[84] et in tantum gentibus hanc virtutem seu munditiam carnis acceptam extitisse, ut in templis earum magni feminarum conventus caelibi se vitae dicarent. Unde Hieronymus, in Epistolam[85] ad Galatas, libro tertio:[86]

---

[64] in *F*] *om. E.*

[65] martyrii *F.*

[66] studeant *CEF.*

[67] virginum *F.*

[68] *om. ABCERT Amb.*

[69] gentiles *FT.*

[70] apposito *A.* Cf. *Acta S. Agathae* 15; *Acta SS.*, Feb. IV, p. 624.

[71] liberaverit E. Amb.

[72] Heliae *CEF Amb.*] Helyae *ABRT.* Cf. *IV Kings* ii. 8 ff.

[73] *om. CEF.*

[74] inf.] infidelibus *CEF.*

[75] pop . . . conversis *om .CEF.*

[76] in se *BR.*

[77] annulo *CF Amb.*

[78] *om. Amb. Vita Sanctae Agnetis* 1. 3, formerly ascribed to St. Ambrose. *Acta SS.*, Jan. II, p. 715; also Michel Andrieu, *Le Pontifical Romain du XIIeme Siècle* I, p. 163. The words: *ipsi sum desponsata* are there only *ad sensum.* They are part of the response to the seventh Lesson of the Feast of St. Agnes for Jan. 21st in the Roman Breviary.

[79] si . . . insignita *om. CEF.*

[80] nostrae *BR.*

[81] *om. Amb.* St. Clement of Rome sees a prototype of the Sacred Orders in the leaders signified by God to Moses as related in *Numbers* xvii. Cf. St. Clement of Rome, *Epist. ad Corinth.* 42, 43; PG I, 291 ff: *Texte und Untersuchungen* 20, pp. 129, 130. He quotes *Isaias lx*, 17, from a version differing somewhat from the Septuagint: St. Isidore of Seville compares the tonsure to the tiara of the priests of the Old Law. *De Eccles. Officiis* 2, 4; PL 83, 780. St. Leo the Great considered that the Wednesday and Friday fasts from which, with the Saturday Vigil, The Ember Days developed were taken from the observance of the Old Law. Cf. *Sermo* XV, 2; PL 54, 174, Cf. *Zacharias* viii. 19.

[82] ipsum *Amb.*

> Quid nos, inquit, oportet facere, in quorum condemnationem habet et Iuno univiras, et Vesta virgines,[86a] et alia idola continentes?

Univiras autem et virgines[86b] dicit quasi monachas[87] quae viros[88] noverant, et monachas[89] virgines. Monos enim, unde monachus, id est, solitarius dicitur, unum sonat. Qui etiam libro primo contra Iovinianum multis de castitate vel continentia gentilium feminarum inductis exemplis:

> Scio,[90] inquit, in catalogo feminarum me plura dixisse . . . ut quae Christianae pudicitiae despiciunt fidem, discant saltem ab ethnicis castitatem.

Qui in eodem supra illam quoque continentiae virtutem adeo commendavit ut[91] hanc praecipue munditiam[92] carnis in omni gente Dominus approbasse[93] videatur, et nonnullis eam[94] infidelibus quoque vel collatione meritorum vel exhibitione miraculorum extulisse.

> Quid referam, inquit,[95] sibyllam Erythraeam atque Cumanam et octo reliquas: Nam Varro decem fuisse autumnat quarum insigne virginitas est et virginitatis praemium divinatio.

Item:[95]

> Claudia Virgo vestalis, cum in suspicionem[96] venisset stupri, . . . fertur cingulo duxisse ratem quam hominum milia trahere nequiverant.

Et Sidonius Claremontensis episcopus in *Propenticon ad Libellum* suum ita loquitur:[97]

> Qualis nec Tanaquil[98] fuit nec illa,
> Quam tu, Trecipitine,[99] procreasti,
> Qualis nec Phrygiae dicata Vestae
> Quae contra[100] satis Albulam tumentem
> Duxit virgineo ratem capillo.

Augustinus, *De Civitate Dei*, libro XXII:[1]

> Iam si ad eorum miracula veniamus, quae facta a diis suis martyribus opponunt nostris, nonne etiam ipsa pro nobis facere et nobis reperientur omnino proficere? Nam inter magna miracula deorum suorum profecto magnum illud est, quod Varro commemorat,[2] vestalem virginem, cum periclitaretur falsa suspicione[3] de stupro, cribrum implesse aqua[4] de Tiberi

---

[83] Close lacuna *CEF*.

[84] coherceret *ABEFRT*. Cf. *Deut.* xxv, 5 ff.

[85] epistola *ABCEHRT*.

[86] 6; PL 26, 462B.

[86a] univirgines *ABCEHRT*.

[86b] univirgines *ACET*.

[87] *add* univiras *ACR Amb*.

[88] univiras suprascript *T*.

[89] univirgines s. s. *T*.] *add* univirgines *Amb*.

[90] sentio *F*. *Text*. 1, 47; PL 23, 288-9.

[91] ut hanc] in hac *CE*.

[92] munditia *CE*.

[93] approbare *CEFR*.

[94] etiam in *Amb*.

[95] *Adversus Iov*. I, 41; PL 23, 283; Ovid, *Fasti* IV, 305 ff.

[96] suspicione *BHR*.

[97] refert *CEF*. Qualis . . . . capillo *om*. *CEF*. *Carmina* 24; MGH, Auctores Antiquissimi VIII, 262-3.

[98] Cf. Livy I, 34.

[99] praecipitine *BHR*. He was the father of Lucretia. Cf. Livy I, 59.

[100] circa *T Amb*.

[1] 22. 11; CSEL 40 V, lb, 616-7; PL 41, 773.

[2] Cf. Pliny *Nat. Hist*. 28, 2. Val. Maximus, *Facta et Dicta Mem*. VIII, 1, 5.

[3] suspitionem *AC Amb*.

[4] *add* de *CE*.

> et ad suos iudices nulla eius parte stillante portasse. Quis aquae pondus . . . tenuit . . . tot[5] cavernis patentibus . . . Itane Deus omnipotens . . . terreno corpori[6] grave pondus auferre non poterit, ut in eodem elemento habitet vivificatum corpus, in quo voluerit vivificans spiritus?

Nec mirum si his[7] vel aliis Deus miraculis infidelium quoque castitatem extulerit, vel officio daemonum extolli permiserit, ut tanto amplius nunc fideles ad ipsam animarentur, quanto hanc in infidelibus quoque amplius exaltari cognoverint. Scimus et Caiphae praelationi[8] non personae prophetiae[9] gratiam esse collatam et pseudo quoque apostolos miraculis nonnumquam[10] coruscasse et haec[11] non personis eorum, sed officio, esse concessa.[12] Quid igitur mirum si Dominus, non personis infidelium feminarum, sed virtuti continentiae ipsarum[13] hoc concesserit[14] ad innocentiam virginis saltem liberandam et falsae[15] accusationis improbitatem conterendam? Constat quippe amorem continentiae bonum esse etiam[16] in infidelibus, sicut et coniugalis pactionis observantiam donum Dei apud omnes esse, ideoque mirabile[17] non[18] videri, si sua dona, non errorem infidelitatis, per signa quae infidelibus fiunt non fidelibus Deus honoret, maxime quando per haec, ut[19] dictum est, et[20] innocentia liberatur et perversorum hominum malitia[21] reprimitur, et ad hoc, quod ita magnificatur bonum, homines amplius cohortantur, per quod tanto minus ab infidelibus quoque peccatur, quanto amplius a voluptatibus carnis receditur. Quod nunc etiam cum plerisque aliis adversus praedictum incontinentem hereticum beatus non inconvenienter induxit[22] Hieronymus ut, quae non miratur in Christianis, erubescat in ethnicis. Quis etiam dona Dei esse deneget potestatem etiam infidelium principum, etsi perverse ipsa utantur, vel amorem iustitiae vel mansuetudinem quam habent lege instructi[23] naturali, vel cetera quae decent principes? Quis bona esse[24] contradicat quia malis sunt permixta, praesertim cum, ut beatus astruit[25] Augustinus et manifesta ratio testatur, mala esse nequeant nisi in natura bona? Quis non illud approbet[26] quod poetica perhibet sententia:[27] Oderunt peccare boni virtutis amore? Quis Vespasiani nondum imperatoris miraculum quod Suetonius[28] refert, de caeco videlicet et claudo per eum curatis, non magis approbet quam neget ut eius virtutem amplius aemulari velint principes, aut quod de anima Traiani beatus egisse Gregorius refertur?[29] Noverunt[30] homines in coeno[31] margaritam[32] legere et a paleis grana discernere. Et dona sua infidelitati adiuncta Deus ignorare non potest, nec quicquam horum quae fecit odire. Quae, quo amplius signis coruscant, tanto amplius sua esse demonstrat, nec hominum pravitate sua inquinari posse, et qualis sit fidelibus sperandus[33] qui talem se exhibet infidelibus. Quantam autem apud infideles dignitatem devota illa templis pudicitia sit adepta vindicta violationis indicat. Quam scilicet vindictam Iuvenalis commemorans in quarta satira, *Contra Crispinum*, sic de ipso ait:[34]

---

[5] *F* adds several words.
[6] Corpore *E*] corporum *R*] corporis *H*.
[7] ab *F*] *om. C.*
[8] praelatione *BCEHR*.
[9] *om. T. Amb.* Cf. *John* xi, 49 ff.
[10] nonnusquam *T. Amb.*
[11] hoc *A.*
[12] Cf. *Matt.* xxiv, 24; St. Augustine, *De diversis Quaestionibus* 79, 3; PL 40, 92.
[13] earum *CEFH.*
[14] concessit *CF.*
[15] falce *T.*
[16] et *C Amb.*
[17] *add* est *CE.*
[18] *add* debet *F.*
[19] hoc *ACEF.*
[20] *om. Amb.*
[21] malicia *A.*
[22] Hier . . . esse *om. CE.*
[23] ut . . . esse *om. F.*
[24] est corrected to esse (*s.m.*) *A. om. CEF.*
[25] adstruit *Amb.* Cf. *De Civ. Dei.* XII, 6; CSEL 40, 1, p. 574; PL 41, 353; *Opus Imp.* 1, 66, 114; PL 45 1085, 1124.
[26] approbat *A.*
[27] Horace *Epp.* 1, 16, 52.
[28] Suetonius, *Vitae Caesarum*, Vespasian 7.
[29] refert *CE.* Gregory 'prayed' Trajan's soul into heaven. Cf. Life by John the Deacon, 2, 44; PL 75, 105; by Paul the Deacon 27; PL 75, 56, 57.
[30] *om.* noverunt . . . infidelibus *CEF.*
[31] sceno *T.*
[32] Cf. *Matt.* xiii, 46.
[33] spectandus *T. Amb.*
[34] I, 4, 8-9.

> . . . Cum quo nuper vittata[35] iacebat,[36]
> Sanguine adhuc vivo terram subitura sacerdos.
>
> Unde et Augustinus, *De Civitate Dei*, libro III: Nam et ipsi, *inquit*,[37] Romani antiqui in stupro detectas Vestae[38] sacerdotes vivas . . . defodiebant, adulteras autem feminas, quamvis aliqua damnatione, nulla tamen morte plectebant; usque adeo gravius quae putabant adyta[39] divina quam humana cubilia vindicabant.

Apud nos autem Christianorum cura principum tanto amplius vestrae[40] providit castimoniae, quanto eam sanctiorem esse non dubitatur. Unde Iustinianus Augustus:

> Si quis, inquit,[41] non dicam rapere, sed attemptare[42] tantum causa iungendi matrimonium sacras virgines ausus fuerit, capitali poena feriatur.

Ecclestiasticae quoque sanctio disciplinae, quae poenitentiae remedia non mortis supplicia quaerit, quam severa sententia lapsus vestros[43] praeveniat non est dubium.

Unde illud est Innocentii papae Victricio episcopo Rothomagensi Capitulo 13:[44]

> Quae[45] Christo spiritualiter nubunt et a sacerdote velantur, si postea vel publice nupserint, vel occulte corruptae fuerint, non eas admittendas esse ad agendam poenitentiam, nisi[46] is cui se coniunxerant[47] de hac vita discesserit.[48]

Hae vero quae necdum[49] sacro velamine tectae,[50] tamen[51] in proposito virginali semper se simulaverunt[52] permanere, licet velatae non fuerint,[53] his agenda aliquanto[54] tempore[55] poenitentia est, quia sponsio earum a Domino tenebatur. Si enim inter homines solet bonae fidei contractus nulla ratione dissolvi, quanto magis ista pollicitatio quam cum Deo pepigerunt solvi sine vindicta non poterit? Nam si apostolus Paulus, quae a proposito viduitatis discesserant,[56] dixit[57] eas habere condemnationem *quia primam fidem irritam fecerunt*, quanto magis[58] virgines quae prioris propositionis fidem minime servaverunt? Hinc et Pelagius ille notabilis ad filiam Mauritii:[59]

> Criminosior est, inquit, Christi adultera quam mariti. Unde pulchre Romana Ecclesia tam severam nuper de huius modi statuit sententiam ut vix vel[60] poenitentia dignas iudicaret quae sanctificatum Deo corpus libidinosa coinquinatione violassent.

Quod[61] si perscrutari velimus quantam curam, quantam diligentiam et caritatem sancti doctores, ipsius[62] Domini et apostolorum exemplis incitati devotis semper exhibuerint feminis, reperiemus eos summo[63] dilectionis zelo devotionem earum amplexos fuisse et fovisse et multiplici doctrinae vel exhortationis studio earum religionem iugiter instruxisse atque auxisse.

---

[35] vitata *ABR*] vitiata *Amb.*] vitatta *H.*

[36] By correction *A.*

[37] 3. 5; CSEL 40, 1, p. 114; PL 41, 82.

[38] vestales *F.*

[39] abdita *BCERT Amb.*] audita *HR.*

[40] nostrae *F. Amb.*

[41] Cf. *Codex Iustinianus* 1, 3, 5; *Corpus Iuris Civilis* II, ed. P. Krueger (Berlin 1915), p. 19.

[42] attentare *FR Amb.*

[43] nostros *A.*

[44] 20 *F*; PL 20, 478-9. Cf. Jaffé, *Regesta Pont. Romanorum* I (Lipsiae, 1885), p. 44; PL 56, 519 ff.

[45] quod *AR.*

[46] hi quibus *F.*

[47] adiunxerat *BCHR.*

[48] decesserit *A*] descesserit *R.*] discesserint *F.*

[49] nec *BHR.*

[50] rectae *A.*

[51] cum *BR.*

[52] simulaverint *C Amb.*

[53] fuerunt *A.*

[54] aliquando *BHR.*

[55] temporis *T.*

[56] recesserant *CEF.*

[57] *I Tim.* v, 12.

[58] potius *ABCEFHR.*

[59] The work of Pelagius, the heretic, from which this extract is taken generally known in the Middle Ages as *Virginitatis Laus.* It is found in several places in PL but not attributed to Pelagius: (a) among the letters of Sulpicius Severus; PL 20, 241C, CSEL 1; (b) as a spurious letter of St. Jerome PL 30, 181A; (c) among the works of Benedict of Aniane, as belonging to St. Athanasius; PL 103, 684B. It is originally one of the decrees of Pope Innocent I, ch. 13; PL 20, 478. Where did Abelard get its true attribution?

[60] illas *CEF.*

[61] Quod si] si autem *CEF.*

Atque, ut ceteros omittam, praecipui doctores Ecclesiae producantur in medium, Origines scilicet, Ambrosius atque Hieronymus. Quorum quidem primus ille, videlicet maximus Christianorum philosophus, religionem feminarum tanto amplexus est zelo ut sibi manus ipse inferret,[64] sicut Ecclesiastica refert Historia,[65] ne ulla eum suspicio a doctrina vel exhortatione mulierum abduceret.

Quis etiam ignoret quantam Ecclesiae divinorum messem librorum rogatu Paulae et Eustochii beatus reliquerit Hieronymus? Quibus inter cetera sermonem etiam de assumptione matris Domini iuxta earum petitionem scribens, idipsum profitetur dicens:[66] *Sed quia negare non queo quicquid iniungitis, nimia vestra devinctus dilectione experiar quod*[67] *hortamini.* Scimus autem nonnullos maximorum doctorum tam ordinis quam vitae dignitate sublimium nonnumquam ad eum de longinquo scribentes parva ab eo requisisse scripta nec impetrasse. Unde et illud est beati Augustini in secundo[68] Retractationum libro:[69]

> Scripsi et duos libros ad presbyterum Hieronymum sedentem in Bethlehem, unum de origine animae,[70] alium de sententia apostoli Iacobi ubi ait: *Quicumque totam legem servaverit, offendat autem in uno, factus est omnium reus*, de utroque consulens eum. Sed in illo priore quaestionem quam proposui ipse non solvi. In posteriore autem quid mihi de illa solvenda videretur[71] non tacui. Sed utrum hoc approbaret etiam[72] illum[73] consului. Respondit[74] autem laudans eamdem consultationem meam; sibi tamen ad respondendum otium non esse respondit. Ego vero quousque esset in corpore hos libros edere nolui ne forte responderet aliquando, et cum ipsa responsione eius potius ederentur. Illo autem defuncto edidi.

Ecce virum tantum tanto tempore pauca et parva rescripta a praedicto viro exspectasse, nec accepisse. Quem quidem ad petitionem praedictarum feminarum in tot et tantis voluminibus vel transferendis vel dictandis sudasse cognovimus, longe eis maiorem quam episcopo reverentiam in hoc exhibens. Quarum fortassis tanto amplius virtutem amplectitur studio, nec contristare sustinet, quanto earum naturam fragiliorem considerat. Unde et nonnumquam zelus caritatis eius erga huiusmodi feminas tantus esse deprehenditur ut in earum laudibus aliquatenus veritatis tramitem excedere videatur, quasi in seipso illud expertus quod alicubi commemorans:[75] Caritas, inquit,[76] mensuram non habet. Qui in ipso statim exordio vitae sanctae Paulae, quasi attentum sibi lectorem praeparare desiderans, ait:[77] Si cuncta mei corporis membra verterentur in linquas, et omnes artus humana voce resonarent, nihil dignum sanctae ac venerabilis Paulae virtutibus dicerem. Descripsit et nonnullas sanctorum Patrum venerabiles vitas[78] atque miraculis coruscas in quibus longe mirabiliora sunt quae referuntur. Nullum tamen eorum tanta laude[79] verborum extulisse videtur quanta hanc viduam commendavit. Qui etiam ad Demetriadem virginem scribens tanta eius laude frontem ipsius insignivit epistolae ut non in modicam labi videatur adulationem:

---

[62] ipsi *A.*

[63] summae *CEFH.*

[64] *add* et *BR*] ut *H.*

[65] 6. 8, 1-2.

[66] PL 30, 126. Now attributed to Paschasius Radbertus. Cf. *Rev. Bénédictine*, V (1888), 347 ff: XLVI (1934), 265 ff. *Journal of Theol. Studies*, XXIV (1923), 176 ff.

[67] quae *F.*

[68] tertio *BHR.*

[69] 71 (45); CSEL 36, 1, 2, p. 184; PL 32, 649.

[70] *add* hominis *F Text.*

[71] *add* ipse *F.*

[72] et *Amb.*

[73] ipsum *CE.*

[74] rescripsit *FG.*

[75] commemoratus *BHR.*

[76] ait *CF. Epp.* 46, 1; CSEL 54, 1, 1, p. 329; PL 22, 483.

[77] *Epp.* 108, 1; *CSEL* 55, 2, p. 306; PL 22, 878.

[78] *Ibid.*, 2.

[79] *om. BR.*

> Inter omnes, inquit,[80] materias quas ab infantia usque ad hanc aetatem vel mea vel notariorum scripsi manu nihil praesenti opere difficilius. Scripturus enim ad Demetriadem virginem Christi quae et nobilitate et divitiis prima est in urbe Romana, si cuncta virtutibus[81] eius congrua dixero, adulari[82] putabor.

Dulcissimum quippe viro sancto fuerat quacumque arte verborum fragilem naturam ad ardua virtutis studia promovere. Ut autem opera nobis quam verba in hoc certiora praebeant argumenta, tanta huiusmodi feminas excoluit caritate ut immensa eius sanctitas naevum[83] sibi propriae imprimeret famae. Quod et ipse quidem ad Asellam de fictis amicis atque sibi detrahentibus scribens inter cetera commemorat dicens:[84]

> Et licet me sceleratum quidam putent et omnibus flagitiis obrutum . . . tu tamen bene facis, quod ex tua mente etiam malos bonos putas. Periculosum quippe est de servo alterius iudicare et non facilis venia prava dixisse de rectis . . . Osculabantur quidam mihi manus et ore vipereo detrahebant. Dolebant labiis,[85] corde gaudebant. Dicant quid umquam in me aliter senserint[86] quam quod Christianum decebat?[87] Nihil mihi obicitur nisi sexus meus, et hoc numquam obiceretur nisi cum Hierosolymam Paula proficiscitur. Item: Antequam domum sanctae Paulae noscerem, totius in me urbis studia consonabant. Omnium pene iudicio dignus summo sacerdotio decernebar. Sed postquam eam pro suo merito sanctitatis venerari, colere, suscipere[88] coepi, omnes me illico deseruere virtutes. Et post aliqua: Saluta, inquit, Paulam et Eustochium, velint nolint, in Christo meas.

Legimus et Dominum ipsum tantam beatae meretrici familiaritatem exhibuisse ut qui eum invitaverat Pharisaeus ob hoc iam penitus de ipso diffideret, apud se dicens:[89] *Hic si esset propheta, sciret utique quae et qualis est*[90] *quae tangit eum*, et cetera.[91] Quid ergo mirum si pro lucro talium animarum ipsa Christi membra eius incitata[92] exemplo propriae famae detrimentum non effugiunt? Quod quidem Origenes, ut dictum est[93] cum cuperet evitare gravius sibi corporis detrimentum inferre sustinuit. Nec solum in doctrina vel exhortatione feminarum mira sanctorum Patrum caritas innotuit, verum etiam in earum consolatione ita vehemens nonnumquam extitit ut ad earum dolorem leniendum nonnulla fidei adversa promittere mira eorum compassio[94] videatur. Qualis quidem[95] illa est beati Ambrosii consolatio quam[96] super morte Valentiniani imperatoris sororibus eius scribere ausus est et eius qui catechumenus sit defunctus salutem[97] astruere,[98] quod longe a catholica fide atque evangelica[99] veritate videtur dissidere.[100] Non enim ignorabant quam accepta Deo semper extiterit virtus infirmioris sexus. Unde et cum innumeras videamus virgines matrem Domini in huius excellentiae proposito sequi paucos agnoscimus viros huius virtutis gratiam adeptos, ex qua quocumque ierit ipsum sequi Agnum valerent.[1] Cuius quidem zelo virtutis cum nonnullae sibi manum inferrent ut quam Deo voverant integritatem etiam carnis conservarent, non solum hoc in eis non est reprehensum[2] sed apud plerosque haec ipsarum martyria titulos eccelesiarum meruerunt. Desponsatae quoque virgines, si antequam viris suis carnaliter misceantur monasterium decreverint[2a] eligere et, homine reprobato, sponsum sibi Deum efficere, liberam in hoc habent facultatem; quam nequaquam viris legimus indultam. Quarum etiam pleraeque tanto ad castimoniam[3] zelo sunt accensae ut non solum contra legis decretum[4] pro custodienda castitate virilem praesumerent habitum, verum etiam inter monachos tantis praeminerent[5] virtutibus ut abbates fieri mererentur. Sicut de beata legimus[6] Eugenia quae sancto etiam Heleno episcopo conscio, immo[7] iubente virilem habitum sumpsit et ab eo baptizata[8] monachorum collegio est sociata.

---

[80] *Epp.* 130, 1; CSEL 56, 1, 3, p. 175; PL 22, 1107.

[81] eius virtutibus *Amb.*

[82] adhulari *T.*

[83] *om. A*] novum *BHR.*

[84] *Epp.* 45, 1. 2; CSEL 54, 1, 3, pp. 323 ff.

[85] *add* et *CEF.*

[86] senserunt *Amb.*

[87] dicebat *AH.*

[88] suspicere *G.*

[89] *Luke* vii, 39.

[90] *add* mulier *F.*

[91] *om. EF Amb.*

[92] incitati *BHR*] incitantes *CEF.*

[93] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 6, 8.

[94] compassione *CEF.*

[95] siquidem *CEF.*

[96] qua *BHR.* Cf. *De Obitu Valentiani Consolatio*, 51; PL 16, 1435.

[97] salute *BHR.*

[98] adstruere *Amb.*

[99] euvangelica *ABR.*

[100] deficere *CF*] deffidere *BEHR.*

[1] Cf. *Apoc.* xiv, 4.

[2] Cf. St. Jerome, *Com. in Ionam.* 1, 12; PL 25, 1129, who permits suicide to save one's chastity. St. Augustine does not agree. Cf. *De Civ Dei* I, 20; CSEL 40, 5, 1, p. 37; PL 41, 34.

Haec ad novissimarum petitionum tuarum primam, soror in Christo carissima, me satis rescripsisse arbitror, de auctoritate videlicet ordinis vestri,[9] et insuper de commendatione propriae dignitatis, ut tanto studiosius vestrae professionis propositum amplectamini, quanto eius excellentiam amplius noveritis. Nunc ut secundam quoque, Domino annuente, perficiam, vestris id meritis et orationibus obtineam.[10] Vale.[11]

[2a] decreverunt *BHR*.
[3] ad cast.] castimoniae *BR*.
[4] Cf. *Deut.* xxii, 5.
[5] praesumerent *A*] praeeminerent *CF*.
[6] Cf. *Vitae Patrum* I; PL 73, 610 ff.
[7] *add* etiam *CEF*.
[8] corrupt *T*.
[9] nostri *BF*.
[10] obtineant *B*] optineant *R*.
[11] valete *BHR*.

GTU Library
3 2400 00660 0757

THREE DAY
CIRCULATION

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall

San Antonio Mission
Bindery
Jolon, Calif.